

Figure 3 – Stakeholder Letters:

### Stakeholder Letters:

---

#### **Support:**

**From:** Michael H. Lloyd Davies [mailto:michaelhld@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, September 13, 2019 12:26 PM  
**To:** Fitzsimmons, Matthew P <Matthew.Fitzsimmons@coloradosprings.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Supporting 532 W. Colorado Ave. Apartments

I appreciate your kind reply, Matthew.

Recently I've both followed and contributed to online social media "discussions" about this proposal, and I'm gaining an appreciation of what an Urban Planner endures. I was surprised to be told, for example, that the residential building at 22 N. Spruce St. doesn't exist.

**My position on this proposal –parking problem aside – is: If not here, where? If not now, when? If not this, what else?**

To advance my position, I'd like to attend those hearings you mention. Is there logistical information online? Also, is there an electronic copy of the project proposal for review?

Thanks for your attention during a busy workday. Meanwhile, best regards, and best wishes.

---

**From:** Kristy Milligan [mailto:kristymilligan@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, September 07, 2019 9:45 AM  
**To:** Fitzsimmons, Matthew P <Matthew.Fitzsimmons@coloradosprings.gov>  
**Subject:** Development on 500 Block of W Colorado

Hi Matthew,

I live very near 20th and Colorado, so I'm not exactly a person who will be impacted by the proposed development of efficiency units in the 500 block of Colorado, but I am initially very excited to hear about this project, and I appreciate the city waiving the parking requirements. Efficiency units are likely to appeal to and accommodate people without transportation, and I just think that's a really wise choice. It is my hope that the city might intervene even more fully to ensure that the units will be somewhat affordable, given our profound housing crisis.

If you are not the appropriate person to express my initial excitement about this project to, would you be willing to share my feedback with the right person?

Thank you,  
Kristy Milligan

**Opposed:**

Thank you Matthew, I was able to get in and review the documentation updates. We do appreciate the developers consideration with their efforts to gain a “no setback” waiver and afford us the ability to have our signage seen from Colorado Ave, but I’ve listed a few comments (concerns) below;

1. The parking and traffic review is **STILL 100%** inaccurate, and taken at absolutely opportunistic times. By this I mean that 6am simply doesn’t demonstrate the levels of activity that we typically see during and immediately before, and after business hours (typical of ALL businesses on Colorado Ave). As illustrated in the image below, the parking that is being shown as unused or “0% - 33%” utilized is **NOT PUBLIC PARKING!** With parking as it is on this side of town, these are **NOT** viable alternatives to on property parking at a new building.



2. The images afforded in the documentation still show no effort to match the “look” that we enjoy on the west side of Colorado Springs. At the last public meeting, there was discussion about the teams coming to review some of the more “historic” buildings and then applying some of their aesthetics to the new development plan. Current rendering looks like every square inch of downtown Denver (as if Ikea threw up). Its simply not a fit.
3. The trees on Chestnut (at the last public meeting) were scheduled to be “replaced” with new trees, and now the docs show that there will simply be pavers along the street? Come on, either leave the trees that have been there forever, or plant new ones... might sound silly, but they were here first.
4. **“The bus stop and Pike Ride Station will reduce parking demand by 5% each. 10% in total”** – Hopefully no one actually believes this. We have a bus stop now that is used primarily by the

homeless during the day. Adding a 5 or 10 station bike station will in NO WAY make an impact on the number of parking spaces required by local businesses and homeowners in our area.

5. "The applicant /owner believes that the proposed apartment building, located within the immediate retail strip, fills a void and provides a multi-family residential component that is non-existent. The 60' proposed building height allows for a 4 story - 50-unit apartment building." The applicant / owner is simply wrong. Why aren't the wishes of the neighborhood occupants and business owners taken into account? It is WAY out of place, it is NOT what the West side has become, and it's not something that we (your West Side Community) are interested in seeing.

Thanks again for continuing to include us on these emails, and again, I really think that with all the new construction (Olympic Museum and Stadium) that Colorado Springs would really be doing itself a favor by buying the property and converting it to a paid parking lot.

Warm regards,

David "Dirty Burke" Brown

[Fallen Heroes Tattoo // Art](#)

[Redemption Ink](#)

---

**From:** Shayla Burnett [mailto:shaylaabvida@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Friday, November 22, 2019 8:57 PM

**To:** Fitzsimmons, Matthew P <Matthew.Fitzsimmons@coloradosprings.gov>

**Subject:** Re: 532 W. Colorado Ave. Apartments - Resubmittal

Thank you for sharing the information.

I noticed in the correspondence that the developer is requesting further waivers to minimum landscape setback widths (unsure if this is the same setback issue already granted or a new one) and to minimal internal landscape area. The developer wants permission to not meet the minimum standards. I disagree with granting this permission for several reasons:

- 1) The developer is already receiving several waivers and accommodations from the city for the project. I encourage city planners to consider the entirety of these permissions for the project. Without a development plan in place, it sets a precedence of acquiescing to developers without the consideration of long-term impacts. This leads to future issues.

- 2) The effects and benefits of green space is well-documented in the scientific literature. It promotes mental health and reduces associated disorders; discourages crime, assists with noise pollution, provides opportunity for physical activity, etc. While the area still has many green spaces, Colorado Springs is increasingly urbanizing. I think it is important to set a precedent now that this is not an area open to cuts. The minimum is set for a reason, and the maintenance of green space will be important to the city's functioning and sustainability far into the future. This is not a request from the developer that should be taken lightly.

2a) Further, previous landscape is crucial in urban areas; has any thought been given as to how this will affect hydrology or the sewer system? Once again, think into the future and how one exception could become the norm.

3) The reasoning given to justify the waiver is not adequate. It cites that the waiver is needed because of site constraints, parking requirements, and providing safe passage - upon a few that they are already receiving waivers?? The developer knew the size of the lot when purchased; this seems to be poor planning on their part and an urge to squeeze too large a structure in too small an area. It passes their poor planning and the costs of maximizing profit onto the residents of the complex and onto the City.

Thank you,

Shayla Burnett, resident

---

**From:** mackeson1 [mailto:mackeson1@aol.com]

**Sent:** Saturday, September 07, 2019 3:02 PM

**To:** Fitzsimmons, Matthew P <Matthew.Fitzsimmons@coloradosprings.gov>

**Subject:** Apts on w colorado

Please, please do not continue to cannibalize the Westside. WE DO NOT NEED a 4 story building in a commercial area. Please listen. The monstrosities on Glenn are bad enough. They look like a collection of containers piled up. You wouldn't want them in your neighborhood.

I have nothing to add. Housing as planned is totally inappropriate. Period.

---

**From:** Shayla Burnett [mailto:shaylaabvida@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Monday, August 26, 2019 4:20 PM

**To:** Fitzsimmons, Matthew P <Matthew.Fitzsimmons@coloradosprings.gov>

**Subject:** Comments on Development Proposal for 532 W Colorado Avenue Apartments

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Development Proposal for the 532 W Colorado Avenue Apartments. I live near on Cucharas and received the notices in the mail.

I have 2 major issues with the development.

1. Parking: I do not agree with allowing the parking space deficiency of 8 spaces (62 adjusted minus 54 proposed) and expecting the nearby neighborhood to absorb the vehicles. The parking analysis seems to overestimate the parking availability. For example, living nearby, I (anecdotally) never see parking spaces available along Colorado. Further, the analysis counts private lots (ie a nearby hotel) as available

parking; that is markedly inaccurate data. Further, this is a deficiency after a generous adjusted rate of 62 from 77 required; technically, the unit is deficient 23 spaces and making unfounded(?) assumptions about potential resident vehicle ownership. Further, the site plan only lists 44 spaces for the unit (a further reduction of 10) of which 18 are compact spaces. The plan is not taking responsibility for resident parking seriously.

As a side note, I recently attended another neighborhood meeting where residents complained about traffic congestion on Colorado, so how is that a non issue?

2. Building height: I do not believe any other buildings in the area are above 2 stories - at least not until you reach downtown Colorado Springs. Further, most buildings are only 1 story. I do not agree with changing the zoning to allow for a 4 story building. The letters claim this will building will not change the neighborhood characteristic; this claim is dismissive to residential concerns and frankly untrue. I believe that a 4-story building will tower along Colorado Ave and make the Westside feel more like downtown - especially if it is a modern looking structure that clashes with the beautiful older homes.

I oppose this proposal based upon the above concerns. I plan to attend the neighborhood meeting to learn more. Thank you.

Shayla Burnett

---

Phone Message from: Jake Anderson  
525 W. Pikes Peak Ave.

Don't like the project at 532 W. Colorado Ave. because:

- I use the parking lot with my kids
- Trees to be removed
- More people we don't want
- The apartments will be an eye sore

No Thank you.  
(719) 659 1772

---

**From:** Gina Maloney [mailto:gina\_iken@msn.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 22, 2019 2:10 PM  
**To:** Fitzsimmons, Matthew P <Matthew.Fitzsimmons@coloradosprings.gov>  
**Subject:** 532 W Colorado Apartments

Mr. Fitzsimmons,

I have some questions about the proposed apartment building on Colorado and the potential remedy for this. The parking issue that is identified by the proposal does not address the parking for the business directly to the east of the proposed development? Is the same owner of that property proposing this development as well? The intent to have parking on street as a remedy to the business And the apartment building? Does the Replat request split the business from the parking lot? With Cerberus just up the street, the increase in on street parking is pretty intense and often flows onto Pikes Peak behind it. I don't believe any of the houses on Pike's Peak have anything but on street parking. Pikes Peak has a pretty significant flow of bicycles on it that are hard to see around all of the current on street parking.

The other concern is traffic – I believe the traffic study is extremely conservative. Colorado Springs has made strides in getting bike share/bus transportation, but it's not as heavily used as vehicles. Traffic on W Colorado is extremely busy and I didn't see any mention of the other developments increase in traffic. The study seems to have been done in a vacuum that doesn't include the other approved developments currently being built or that have been approved.

I am concerned about both parking and traffic and would like to know what other mitigation strategies have been discussed with the developer.

Thank you,

Gina Maloney  
719-243-6854  
17 N 8<sup>th</sup> St  
Colorado Springs, CO 80905

---

**From:** Cory Lyle [mailto:coryjlyle@gmail.com]

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 31, 2019 12:04 PM

**To:** Fitzsimmons, Matthew P <Matthew.Fitzsimmons@coloradosprings.gov>

**Cc:** David B Brown <db@fallenheroestatattoo.com>; Brenda Brown <bb@fallenheroestatattoo.com>; Jayne Blewitt <jayneblew@gmail.com>; Lorrie Myers <lorriemyers@gmail.com>

**Subject:** Objection to proposed 532 W. Colorado Ave Apartments

RE: File numbers CPC PUZ 19-00087, CPC PUD 19-00088 and CPC WR 19-00089

Dear Mr. Fitzsimmons:

I own 520-524 West Colorado Ave, which is the property immediately to the east of the proposed 532 W. Colorado Ave Apartments. While I welcome the influx of new residents into the area, I object to the developer using a PUD zone change in order to avoid providing sufficient parking for the intended use, thereby unduly burdening neighboring businesses and residents.

The idea that the planned 35 onsite parking spaces could adequately serve 54 dwelling units defies all logic for many reasons, including the following:

- The developer's own traffic study recognizes the city's requirement for 62 onsite parking spaces. That underestimates the total parking impact, however, because that onsite parking requirement already accounts for the ability of adjacent on-street parking to absorb normal overflow.
- The reality is that the average Colorado Springs household owns 1.8 cars and the percentage of households without a car is a negligible 4.5% (source: <https://www.governing.com/gov-data/car-ownership-numbers-of-vehicles-by-city-map.html>). Those statistics indicate that this development will bring upwards to 97 cars to the area -- and that does not include visitors and management employees.
- The idea that a significant portion of the residents will use bikes and busses as their sole means of transportation is not reflected in the actual data. The proposed development site is not located in a public transit or pedestrian oriented neighborhood, it is well away from the downtown core and there are no public parking lots within easy walking distance.

**Therefore, the fact that the development site will have access to a bus stop and bike share station might have a marginal impact on traffic, but the reality of the neighborhood means that it will not discourage normal car ownership and parking needs among residents. Moreover, a PUD zone change would reduce onsite parking requirements, but that should not be confused with reducing the *actual* parking requirements, which would simply overwhelm neighboring on-street parking.**

If the development generates the need for 97 parking spaces and only provides 35 onsite spaces, then approximately 62 cars will require on-street parking and the overwhelming majority of them will block existing businesses and residences. While displacing so much parking might not prove problematic elsewhere, the 500 block of West Colorado Avenue presents unique challenges that make it critical to preserve street parking adjacent to existing businesses:

- In many cases, street parking provides the **only practical access to front entries** of existing businesses along the 500 block of West Colorado Avenue. The only parking lot on the block that is visible from West Colorado Ave is the proposed development site. Since a previous developer concentrated customer parking on the west end of what was then a large strip center, only one pedestrian link was established to alternate alley parking and that pedestrian link currently lies on private property and is not available to all businesses. The proposed development will further impede access and visibility to alley parking, making street parking along West Colorado Avenue even more critical to existing businesses. Street parking directly in front of existing businesses is important to many customers, including the safety conscious and first-time customers who are unaware of alley parking (and perhaps some disabled persons).
- There are few crosswalks in the area. There are no signaled crosswalks on West Colorado Ave between Walnut and 8th Streets (for nearly a quarter mile!). With four lanes of fast-moving traffic on West Colorado Avenue, forcing patrons to park even a short distance across the Avenue would put them in considerable danger or else discourage them from patronizing businesses altogether. Either outcome would be detrimental to both the public interest and neighboring businesses. The same safety concerns would also apply to future residents of the proposed development.

**Therefore, it is critical to preserve available street parking adjacent to businesses along the 500 block of West Colorado Avenue.**

The traffic study supplied by the developer suffers from several other flaws, including the following:

- The proposed development site has historically and until recently served as customer parking for the entire 500 block of West Colorado Avenue. This condition was created by a previous developer who concentrated customer parking on the west end of what was then a large strip center. As an example, the most recent "Google Street View" from June, 2018 shows 13 vehicles parked on the proposed development site. The traffic study fails to estimate the impact to street parking once that parking lot is eliminated.
- A large portion of the properties along the 500 block of West Colorado Avenue (the former strip center) are temporarily vacant. The traffic study fails to calculate the impact to street parking as those businesses come back online.

**Therefore, the traffic and parking analysis' assertion that there is "relatively low utilization of adjacent and nearby on-street parking" reflects a temporary condition that will rapidly dissipate as a large parking lot is eliminated and occupancy rates among existing neighboring properties trend towards city averages.**

In summary, I respectfully request that the Planning Commission and City Council require the proposed development to provide onsite parking normally required of such developments (in this case, 62 spaces) and prevent the developer from using a PUD zone change as a means of diminishing their responsibilities to the detriment of surrounding businesses. Doing otherwise will negatively impact public safety and accessibility to established businesses. Moreover, it will compound the effect of removing what has traditionally served as shared parking and place undue stress on limited street parking. Incidentally, when I renovated my property, I was required to construct 30 parking spaces to the rear of my property, and my building is only about 1/4 the size of the proposed building. The city was right to establish such precedent and should adhere to it in this case.

Could you also please share the dates and times of any hearings on this matter that are open to the public?

Thank you for your consideration,

Cory Lyle - Managing Member, Oculus Investments, LLC

---

**From:** Burke Lee [mailto:db@fallenheroestatattoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 26, 2019 9:31 PM  
**To:** Fitzsimmons, Matthew P <Matthew.Fitzsimmons@coloradosprings.gov>  
**Cc:** Cory Lyle <coryjllye@gmail.com>; Brenda Brown <bb@fallenheroestatattoo.com>; info@fallenheroestatattoo.com  
**Subject:** 54 Unit Apartment Building

Good evening everyone, I'm writing this email in reference to the proposed 54 Unit Apartment building being planned for the empty lot next (immediately west) to our studio.

Firstly, a couple facts about the studio that my wife and I started in 2016 with every last penny in our savings account;



- Our studio, Fallen Heroes Tattoo // Art has become a bit of a Colorado landmark in the short time that we've been open.
- We are now the largest studio in the United States and our work is internationally recognized.
- We support our local community from Soldiers, Firefighters, First responders to teachers and cancer victims and their families. In our short time in business, we've donated back to the community in excess of 225K. Not much for some, but for a small, family owned and run Tattoo Studio, we like to think that we've done more than most.
- We started RedemptionInk.org and have been on the news (multiple major networks including FOX, NBC, ABC and BBC) for our work to erase or cover racial and gang related tattoos.

Along with several other considerations that were made when we chose this location, some of the major rationale for our decision was;

- Location on Colorado Avenue (our largest art district)
- Proximity to downtown
- Planning discussion that we had with the agents at Hoff and Leigh regarding the plans for updating this area to match and integrate with Old Colorado City since the sign had been moved (2015)
- West view from our windows and doors on the west of our studio (mountains and beautiful sunsets)
- My wife and I grew up, fell in love and raised our kids here, so we wanted to stay "home"
- Low traffic, low crime, low noise
- Did I already mention the views?

Finally some points / inquiries that I'd like to make in opposition to adding yet another "loft" type structure in Old Colorado City VS. Denver where they are everywhere and an eyesore;

- With 54 units, where will the occupants park?
- This building would change the appeal and look of our little area all together, there are several small businesses that would suffer if this building goes up.
- Parking is already an obstacle for all of the businesses on this block, and tenants / guests would absolutely impact our small parking lot to the north of our studio. We run a small business and have no time to monitor who parks where and what tow truck needs to come and remove those parked in our lot.
- What will our egress be to the west?
- We paid \$3500 for a hand painted, city approved mural on our west wall. Blocking this is out of the question, as the artist is a well known Colorado artist, and the signage draws clients attention as they drive eastbound on Colorado Avenue.
- Our building has windows the length of the studio on the West facing wall that we love to open and enjoy the natural sunshine through, also decreasing our energy consumption in the winter months. Surely we should have some rights against anything blocking them?
- Our building has an egress to the west, this is mandated by the fire code to be 100% unlocked and useable during business hours. I'm assuming that I would have some sort of ability to stop any planned blockage of that door?

- When the new owners of the empty lot put up barricades around their lot, they put every business in our block at immediate risk. None of our businesses have automated fire suppression systems, and the water source for the fire trucks is at the west facing entrance to our building. I spoke with the FD and Police who agreed that this was a careless act, but said that we could do nothing about them barricading their property regardless of dangers to us and our clientele. In my opinion, people willing to make a decision like that without ever addressing the existing occupants (neighbors) don't really belong in this very tight, very close community.

I don't know what else to say, along with several other small business owners in the neighborhood, I'm a bit shocked that this is even a consideration for such an incredibly historic section of our city.

In closing, I'd suggest that if these developers want to build trendy lofts, let them do it in Boulder or Denver where they apparently can't get enough of it.

I appreciate your time in reviewing this correspondence and look forward to your response.

Warm regards,

DB

[Fallen Heroes Tattoo // Art](#)

[Redemption Ink](#)