Cooper, Austin P

From: Brenda Rico <momrico@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 1, 2024 9:27 AM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek

To Whom it May Concern,
We want our concerns to be part of the public record. We are adamantly opposed to an apartment complex being built in this area. We have a high school right across the street and a senior complex right behind where that would be constructed. It would also lower the value of our homes in this area and destroy sight lines. When school is in progress there is a lot of congestion and this would highly complicate the traffic as well as increase the probability of accidents. We have a lot of students that walk to school in this area and it puts them at risk. We are also concerned that it will increase crime in our area. Thank you for your consideration.
Sent from my iPhone

Cooper, Austin P

From: Dana Day <danaday814@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 7, 2024 9:17 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: flats at sand creek

Sir,
I am vehemently against this development.
The proposed development is directly across Peterson Road from my home. Peterson Road already experiences high traffic at times daily. Air pollution and noise pollution is already very discerning. Sand Creek High School and the safety of the students and teachers would be negatively impacted by the increase in automobile, truck, bus, and foot traffic will be significantly more problematic.
I have no doubt that my concerns will be ignored by the Planning Board. Anyone who has lived in Colorado Springs is aware that these board members are pro development and to hell with the citizens. Until these individuals are terminated from their positions and the will of most of our citizens are honored, the developers will have their wishes granted.
Still, I will make my wishes known.

Yancey and Dana
3975 Riviera Grove #203

Cooper, Austin P

From: Donald Silva <dhsilva527@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 8, 2024 2:53 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Cc: STV-Mark B; STV-Doc; STV-KenSherry; STV-OtisAnne; STV-Ray
Subject: Proposed Project

Austin Cooper Senior Planner, Colorado Springs,

I am an original owner/resident at 4279 Stonesthrow View, Colorado Springs, CO. I acknowledge receipt of "Notification of Proposed Development Project Near My Property". My concerns and suggestions coincide well with those articulated and sent to you by Mark and MaryKay Biernacki.
I look forward to remaining informed on this proposal.

Donald Silva 9/8/24
Sent from my iPhone

Cooper, Austin P

From: Jean Otto <grlnlevis@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, September 13, 2024 10:23 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: DEPN-24-0133

I am so disgusted with the Land Use Review team. Are you all from California? You see a lot of land and you immediately think.....we need to build something on that. And YOU , Mr. Cooper, say you feel connected to the greenways of Colorado Springs, I think we have different ideas of how to feel connected to the earth. You want to destroy the land by building on it, you can't let the land just be land. This committee and the city counsel have destroyed our city and the reason many of us moved/live here. Over saturating the land with houses and apartment buildings, blocking views, increasing the population so that the recent upgrade to our infrastructure is now outdated AGAIN!.....wasting taxpayers money, not to mention the incredible amount of traffic and where is the water going to come from? There's not enough water, we as residents shouldn't absorb the extra cost as well as incur the restrictions because you keep building and there's not enough water. When are you going to tell the builders no? When does this stop? When is enough, enough? When is a way of life more valuable than the money Norwood or O'Neil is bribing you with? The people in those condos off of Golf Tee paid a premium for the view they have and now you want to just disregard them as if they don't matter, just like you did with Classic off of Tutt. Building on every piece of land in the city is not progress, it's destruction. This proposal is not for the betterment of the city, it's greed. You all should be ashamed of yourselves and you, Austin Cooper, are clearly not connected. There's a blatant and obvious disconnect between this Land Use Review team and what used to be the charm and beauty of Colorado Springs. You will go down in history as the destroyers of what used to be a wonderful city to live in.....you and suthers (that is not a misspell, he doesn't deserve to have his name capitalized) and now Mobolade, are in bed with these big money builders. You have no integrity. Do not build the project Flats at Sand Creek. How about a dog park?.....Pup Park Flats at Sand Creek sounds much better. I vote, not just NO, but Hell NO on project Flats at Sand Creek, do not build a multifamily anything there. Stand up and represent the residents, not the builders, the residents don't want this.

Jean Otto

Cooper, Austin P

From: Joanna Vengard <jmvengard@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 2, 2024 6:58 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek

Sir: I received the notice concerning the development plan for the flats at sand creek. Could you be a little more specific about the project? Will these be apartments, condos or townhomes? Will they be for sale or rentals?
I would appreciate hearing from you. Thank you.

Joanna Vengard
3992 riviera grove
Jmvengard@hotmail.com

Cooper, Austin P

From: John Kistler <kistlerj@earthlink.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 17, 2024 7:20 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Cc: John Kistler
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek

Austin,

We are residents of Stonesthrow View. Below is the some feedback regarding the Flats Creek Development,

Infrastructure concerns...

Are there enough resources to share with our small community? Water, waste and sewage, roads, etc.
What about noise from traffic (constant drag racing) most of the day?
Will any kind of covenants be put in place?
We don't want our beautiful community's aesthetics to be compromised by this building.
Thanks for allowing feedback.

Dr. John and Jenny Kistler.
4202 Stonesthrow View
Colorado Springs 80922

Cooper, Austin P

From: kim dodge <kdcoy64@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 9, 2024 9:28 AM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Objection to project Flats at Sand Creek

Hello Austin,

I would like to object to the Flats at Sand Creek Apartments proposed at N Carefree and Peterson Rd. I have serious concerns about traffic with the number of units (144) which will likely mean double that number for cars who reside there plus visitors. Not only would it interfere with access to my neighborhood on Peterson, it would also have a major impact on traffic in the area, which is already extremely congested especially on school days and school events. I also object to “apartments” being proposed vs single family or townhomes. All of the neighboring parcels are individually owned and I would like to see a future project on that parcel to be owned instead of rented and with fewer units.

Best Regards,

Kim Dodge

3732 Riviera Grove #101

Cooper, Austin P

From: Kimberly Moore <kimberlymoore193@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 9:00 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek/Record Number DEPN-24-0133

Good evening, hope all is well.

Please see my opinion as to why I am NOT in favor of the development of Flats at Sand Creek.

Location:

N. Carefree Circle and Peterson Road are very busy streets and are considered main thoroughfares for the community. Having such a project on the corner of these two streets, will cause traffic issues, parking issues, and safety concerns for the workers involved.

Crime:

Crime will increase from the onset of this development. It is a known fact that construction sites and new builds (homes/apartment developments) are a prime target for burglaries, theft, and vehicles being broken into. From equipment and supplies, being left out in the open, to the conexes being broken into, and workers leaving their vehicles open. If built, the units will then get burglarized for the new appliances. All of this will set the project back in time, money, community resources.

Most developers will not hire a security company to patrol the property, let alone put up adequate video cameras. This will put additional strain on an already strained police department. From fielding the calls, being able to dispatch an officer to take the report in a timely manner, and managing expectations of what the police can and can't do.

Environment:

There are currently dozens of apartment developments being built throughout Colorado Springs. Can we have one lot of undisturbed land for the community? Having this open space is a resource for the environment, housing insects and bees, which are vital to our ecosystem. Some people just see a field of grass and trees, but they are blind to the benefits it provides, from clean water and natural flood control to wildlife habitats. There are two local foxes, which live and roam through this field. Having a home for bees is vital to pollination.

Mental Health

I have been in my home for 1.5 years now. I chose to purchase this house for a few reasons, it was close to my job, my daughter's school, my hairdresser, my nail salon, stores and shopping. The one feature I fell in love with was the view from my kitchen and bedroom windows. I have a beautiful view of the mountains. This view, in my opinion, brings me closer to God and my faith. When I see these mountains, a sense of peace comes over me. People throughout the neighborhood come to this lot and take pictures of the view. This unobstructed view provides a sense of calm, which can lower stress and anxiety. It is well documented how open spaces/green spaces have a direct impact on better mental health.

I am all for community growth and expansion, but that doesn't mean we need yet another housing development on the corner of a busy street. I much rather have growth within the individual, which will in turn benefit the community and their fellow neighbors.

September 6, 2024

Mr. Austin Cooper, Senior Planner
Land Use Review Division
City Administration Building
30 S. Nevada Ave, Suite 705
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

RE: Flats at Sand Creek (DEPN-24-0133) by Lincoln Ave. Capital

Mr. Cooper,

We are the owners of 4255 Stonesthrow View located north of and adjacent to the above referenced project. We have reviewed the plans you shared with us via email on September 3, 2024 and other submittals you referenced as part of our conversation with you on September 5, 2024. We have the following preliminary comments (NOTE: these views do not necessarily represent the views of our Homeowners Association as a whole. However, we did have some informal discussion with our immediate neighbors and they share many of the same concerns below):

A. Density, Design and Area Development Trends

1. While we recognize the higher density allowances of the site's existing zoning classification, we were pleased that the former project proposed and approved for this site (Sand Creek Townhomes, AR DP-21-00650) came in at only 76 units, or 11 +/- units per acre. We were accepting of that project in that such a density more closely matched the condominium project to the west and blended nicely with the lower densities of the surrounding residential subdivisions to the north and northeast. Now, this new project nearly doubles the number of units and the resulting density. It is requested that the new project's 144 units, or 21+/- units per acre, be revised downward in keeping with the spirit of the former approved plan and to better blend with the existing character and density of the surrounding neighborhoods.

2. There is nothing closely approximating this project's density in the immediate area. Multi-family uses having this density belong closer to the regional commercial areas further to the west. The various apartments at First and Main along Tutt Blvd. come to mind. There, they appropriately serve as a transitional land use between the more intense commercial areas to their west and the lower

density residential projects to their east. To place the higher densities of a “First and Main” type of project within the lower density neighborhoods at Carefree and Peterson, which is so much further to the east, does not, in our view, make sense from this broader city planning perspective.

3. Yes, the subject property’s current R-5 zoning classification allows for the higher densities as proposed. However, the site’s configurations, extreme grades and slopes, and other limitations make the densities of the proposed project impractical as discussed elsewhere in this letter. These limitations alone are justification for a multi-family project having much lower densities.

4. This project’s proposed buildings have a bulky and block-like appearance to them. Like the former approved project, perhaps these proposed buildings can instead have varied and articulated building facades and be “stair-stepped” with two stories on the ends of the buildings and the three stories in the middle. This would allow for a more unique and interesting aesthetic instead of being simply more of the same as seen elsewhere in town.

B. Parking Lots and Spaces

1. We believe evidence of this project having too many units for the site can be seen in the design of the parking lot. The parking spaces along the northern edge of the site will have little utility and no practical value for everyday use, other than to meet the zoning code’s minimum number of spaces requirement. They are somewhat distant from the door and entries to the apartments requiring an inconvenient walk around the retaining walls and down the one north-south access road into the center of the site. We believe these parking spaces will instead be used as overflow parking for larger vehicles, inoperable vehicles, RV/trailer storage, and other uses detrimental to our homes along the site’s northern boundary. Eliminating these spaces and reducing the overall number of dwelling units in a manner similar to that of the former approved project, is the preferred site design for this proposed project.

2. We count 65 (26%) of the project’s proposed 252 parking spaces are designed as “compact” car spaces. We believe they are being “squeezed in” to simply meet the parking space per unit requirement that matches the number of dwelling units that are already too high for this site. Furthermore, in practice, compact cars only in “compact” spaces are rarely, if ever, enforced on private property. Again, we feel the design and inclusion of “compact” spaces are simply being proposed to address what is already too many dwelling units for the site.

B. Landscaped Buffer Area Along Northern Border

1. There are 28 trees and other plantings along the proposed northern property line. The former project had 51 trees and other plantings. It is requested that the new project have at least as many trees/plantings along the northern property line as was proposed in the former project. It is also requested that sufficient irrigation systems be installed in this landscaped area.

2. The trail along the northern edge of the site is redundant given pedestrians can use the adjoining east-west lane/parking area. The area where the trail currently is proposed can be better utilized with the placement of an earthen berm between the lane/parking area and the strip of landscaping along the northern property line. This would better buffer the project's traffic noise along with the glare and headlights that will otherwise shine into the back of our homes. If underground utilities prevent the placement of a berm, another parallel row of equally dense plantings as those proposed (and revised per above) along the northern property line should be installed.

3. To facilitate the berm and/or extra landscaping, the drainage swale currently proposed at the western end of the landscaped area should be instead incorporated into the east-west lane/parking area such as what was proposed in the former approved project.

4. In the event some of the parking space along this east-west lane are retained, it is requested that the plans be "reversed" with the perpendicular spaces being placed on the south side of the lane, facing the apartments, with the parallel spaces being placed along the northern edge of the parking area.

C. Access and Traffic

1. All traffic generated by the project's dwelling units will only have one means of access to the site (off of the northern east-west lane). We do not believe this will allow for sufficient and proper emergency access for the proposed high number of dwelling units. There is room for a full access from Pony Tracks (at the break in the retaining wall) as well as perhaps an access, with deceleration lane, from Peterson just north of the detention pond. Consideration should also be given to including a "grand entrance," with proper traffic engineering geometrics, to the site off of Carefree. These additional access points will also help to disperse this project's overall traffic volume, all of which will otherwise be heading directly toward and passing by our homes to the north.

2. The former plan for the east-west road was to include a "private access only" sign at its entrances from Pony Track and Peterson. It is requested that the same be included as part of this new plan.

3. The inclusion of speed bumps and other traffic calming measures within the east-west lane should be considered to lessen the potential for cut-through traffic

D. Other items

1. Are the finished floor elevations of the 37.5-foot-high buildings known yet, particularly buildings numbered 2, 3, and 4? We would like to determine what would be the apparent visual height of these buildings relative to the higher elevation of our adjoining homes.

2. The current road surface on Pony Tracks is in rough shape. Consideration should be given to how this project's increased traffic may further the need to repair/resurface this local street.

3. All parking lot and building lighting must be shielded to cast any light away from adjoining properties.

4. Please request that Lincoln Ave. Capital provide examples of other projects they developed in the area or elsewhere in Colorado that they believe are comparable to this proposed project.

Thank you for your and the City's consideration of these preliminary requests. As the project evolves, we and our neighbors may have more comments to add and suggest.

Respectfully,

Mark and Mary Kay Biernacki
4255 Stonesthrow View
Colorado Springs, CO 80922
815-739-3111

Copies: John Tinan, Stonesthrow HOA Board President
Stonesthow Homeowners

Cooper, Austin P

From: Mike Dee <mikebrewdee@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 6:21 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Cc: Michael E Gs-12 Usaf Afspc Afspc/ A3/ Dee,
Subject: Comment on Record Number DEPN-24-0133

Mr. Cooper,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the development in my neighborhood, at the Northeast corner of N Carefree Circle and Peterson Road.

I am opposed to the planned this development of this land for several reasons.

1. This 144 unit development is identified as “Multi-Family High” which I suspect either the “high” is in either reference to the height of the development, or high density. Either way neither type of development fits in with the character of the neighborhood. A few years ago a developer placed townhouses on the Southwest corner and that type of multi-family development fits in much better with this neighborhood.

2. Serious concerns with the traffic congestion and safety of adding hundreds of vehicles needing to ingress/egress in near proximity to an already busy intersection not to mention a nearby school.

3. As seen in other parts of town with this type of development, there is never adequate parking provided for the residents and their guests. This leads to parked vehicles to overflow onto the side streets. This is a problem in the residential portions of the neighborhood already and would be exacerbated by this development along one of the main ingress/egress routes for this neighborhood.

I have spoken with several of my neighbors and they all have agreed with my views.

Thank you for your consideration.

Very Respectfully,

Michael Dee
4196 Pony Tracks Dr
Colorado Springs, CO 80922

Sent from my iPhone

Cooper, Austin P

From: Nuala Poulos <nualabe@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2024 10:48 AM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek. Rec # DEPN-24-0133

To whom it may concern,

Please consider comments regarding the proposed development project on N. Carefree and Peterson Rd. Colorado Springs.
There have been conversations regarding this proposed development project on Nextdoor.

The following have been discussed:

1. There is no design plan for people to be able to see what an out of state developer wants to do here in Colorado Springs. We are supposed to just wait till the development is approved and then see a plan.

2. There is a big vacancy rate in apartment rentals in Colorado Springs right now. There are also a lot of homes in this area available for rent, not to mention the rental price for a home right now is not much different than the apartments. This does not include all the apartment complexes in the process of being built and there are tons.

3. With all the vacancies right now where are all these people going to come from. And before you answer that, what happens when we have a catastrophic event that everyone has to get out of town, can you imagine the jam on the Interstate then. The interstate can't handle what we have already. The city is being made a death trap.

4. We don’t have adequate water. Water restrictions: how are you planning on supplying water to all the new apartments and homes.

5. With all these new apartments in Colorado Springs, why with their taxes, are the Utilities not lowered and the roads not making much progress or at minimum very slow progress.

6. What is the traffic flow plan? And how many floors will this new building have? What is the current Zoning restriction on the number of floors? Will that need to be modified? Who gets to make that decision?

generally speaking
It's not even a local company, what do they care. We don't have sufficient services, tried finding Dr. accepting new patients lately. Not enough law enforcement for the issues we have already. They don't even have a design; wait they want to have it approved before a plan is available. We have a large percentage of vacancy already for apartments in the Springs.

They rents are out of control, they are more than my mortgage and you get less. Young families will never be able to get on their feet here.

Why do we need more apartments anyway when Polis has said you can't limit the number of people residing in one. You can have 20 people in an apartment if you want. Thus, where will they park all the cars. 144 apartments could be 288 cars or more.

What those people won't be told is that they will be living on a racetrack which is what N. Carefree has become.

Have you watched the High School Kids try to make it safely and all the traffic around the school. Peterson Rd and N. Carefree is an accident zone.

Have you met the man in his 80's at Starbucks every day, who has been on the waiting list for senior income-based housing and living out of a suitcase. He is a native Coloradoan with not where to live but wait he has been told he should be getting closer. By that he has been told 18 months.

Our planning Commission for Colorado Springs is unrealistic and don't seem to be concerned about the safety of this town. They don't care about safety and common sense.

Nuala

719-963-4726

Mr. Austin Cooper, Senior Planner
30 S. Nevada Ave. Suite 705
Colorado Springs, Co. 80903
September 12, 2024

Re; Flats at Sand Creek

Mr. Cooper,

HISTORY: When we purches our home at 4249 Stones throw Vw., a commute of 34 homes our property was adjacent to the property owned by the Church of Christ. At that time they were going to build a new church on the property but in 2021 they sold it to Sand Creek homes to build 76 two story homes. To make that possible we were ask to vote to change the zoning to R5, this would result 11 homes per acre. This was an acceptable use of the land from our point of view. We would NEVER have voted for 21 homes per acre. This development plan is far to dense for ther area.

One of our neighbors Mark Biemacki sent you a very well written letter expressing our concerns, which we entirely agree with. I would like to expand on a few of his points.

In a usual housing development plan our front part of our property is exposed to vehicular and people traffic and our back yard is more private exposed to only our neighbors. In the submitted plan the path would put people traffic with in 10-12 feet of our back yards. Yes, the trail needs to be replaced with a berm-tall as possible.

The use (number)of trees, mostly evergreens and other planting needs to be increased not reduced.(28-51). This will help mask the vehicular and large swimming pool parties noise.

Parking area-this plan has head in parking spaces on the north side of the drive. This would result in car head lights shining in the bedrooms of eight homes plus the slamming of car doors possibly until 2 AM. This parking area needs to moved to the south side of the road.

Traffic-It appears that 288 cars will use the east-west road a minimum of twice daily. This could be reduced by adding a entrance on Pony Tracks between the two east buildings.

The wording Private access only would be placed on all entrance monuments.

Speed bumps shall be placed in both directions on the east end and the west end of the east-west road to reduce cut-thru traffic.

Developing residential properties have many problems to solve, the two main ones I see here are building height and density, but working together we have a better chance solve our problems.

I am looking forward to meeting you and working with the P&Z.

Best regards

Dr. Otis Moreland PharD
4249 Stonesthrough Vw.
Colorado Springs, Co. 80922

September 6, 2024

Mr. Austin Cooper, Senior Planner

Land Use Review Division

City Administration Building

30 S. Nevada Ave, Suite 705

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

RE: Flats at Sand Creek (DEPN-24-0133) by Lincoln Ave. Capital

Mr. Cooper,

We live at 4285 Stonesthrow View and our property faces Southwest and directly next to the split rail fence at the Northwest corner of the proposed project We have so much traffic and noise from Peterson Blvd already and are very concerned with the size of this project and the additional traffic it will bring. Vehicle headlights at night turning into the complex would shine directly into our unit. We do have some evergreens but a bigger gap where one of the proposed entrances/exits would be and we could have a lot of cars turning in there. Can there by an entrance at North Carefree instead?

We would like to reference the comments submitted by Mark and MaryKay Biernacki and **we concur and share the same concerns referenced in their letter for the amount of units, parking, entrances, shrubs**, **etc**. Being able to look at something pleasantly aesthetic would help our property values and what we love about our community. I hope you will consider our concerns and keep us informed in the coming days.

Thank you for your consideration and allowing us to voice our concerns.

Ray and Peggy Purvis

4285 Stonesthrow View

Colorado Springs CO 80922

Cooper, Austin P

From: Samantha Robbins <samantha.hooker@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 4, 2024 10:47 AM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Comments for Record #: DEPN-24-0134

Hello Austin,

Thank you for the notice of development by our home, for record DEPN-24-0134. Can you please help us understand a few details about the proposed project, are there any more details you can share? Overall we are concerned about the proximity of an apartment building to our home.

1. What is the actual distance of the new structures from the existing boundary to The Trails at Aspen Ridge?
2. Will these apartments be low-income, middle income or luxury properties?
3. How many stories will the building be?
3. Is there anything else you can share about the nature of the target market for these residences?

Thank you,

Samantha Robbins
samantha.hooker@gmail.com
443-614-6070

September 11, 2024

Mr. Austin Cooper, Senior Planner
Land Use Review Division
City Administration Building
30 S. Nevada Ave, Suite 705
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

RE: Flats at Sand Creek (DEPN-24-0133) by Lincoln Ave. Capital

Mr. Cooper,

My letter concerns the development of the 6+ acres at Peterson Rd and N Carefree Cir, the 140 plus "affordable" apartments being proposed directly to the south of our HOA. This property was originally proposed as a church, not a multitude of apartments. The fire station capacity, police station and high school were probably designed to accommodate said church, not a 140 unit housing development with a highly increased traffic flow in an already congested intersection. I worry about the increased traffic in light of what happened at Doherty High School last year with the safety of our children. Will there need to be more bond issues to enable the increase of the capability of the fire station and police station?

Has a traffic study been completed? Do you know what will occur with this many new vehicles in the small congested area? Has the increased noise been considered and head lights in homes of the existing residents?

We would totally agree with the comments by Mark and MaryKay Biernacki dated Sep 6, 2024 in reference to the parking situation and ingress and egress of this project. They mention many problems that need to be addressed before this project proceeds.

Thank you.

Mike Kruse
Sharon Patterson
4267 Stonesthrow Vw
Colorado Springs, CO 80922

COMMENTS TO THE CITY CONCERNING THE PROPOSED DEVELOPOMENT SOUTH OF THE STONESTHROW NEIGHBORHOOD

Mr. Austin Cooper, Senior Planning Devision

Land Use Review Division

City Administration Building

30 S. Nevada Ave Sute 705

Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903

RE: Flats at Sand Creek (DEPN-24-0133) by Lincoln Ave. Capital

Mr. Cooper,

I am Stacy L. (Bensenberg) Smith, and my sister is Lori K. (Bensenberg) Bennett. We are the daughters of Mrs. Lanelle M. Bensenberg, owner of 4261 Stonesthrow View, also known as LMB Living Trust, located North of and adjacent to the above referenced project. We have reviewed the information which you sent via email to Mr. Mark Biernacki of 4255 Stonesthrow View, who then forwarded a print copy of the information via USPS mail. We have our Mother's POA and are sending comments to you regarding our suggestions and recommendations concerning the proposed Flats at Sand Creek Apartments project, with our Mother's approval. We have discussed them with her before sending them on to you. We apologize for sending them to you at the last minute, but we have both been out of town at various times since Labor Day and did not receive the mailings right away. Plus it has been difficult to get together with our mother and discuss the details of the project with her,

We have read over all the comments and recommendations sent to you by Mr. Biernacki and fully concur with all of them. We will try not to repeat too much of what he has said but we do have things which we wish to emphasize on our own.

Our Mother has lived in her home on the south side of Stonesthrow since the units were first built. She loves her home, and as a senior citizen with a disability who can't get out very often, she loves the peace and quiet of her neighborhood and

especially the views from her back balcony, back den and bedroom windows. She truly enjoys the beautiful view of the mountains and also likes to watch what is going on across North Carefree Blvd, especially at the high school. So naturally she is concerned about the changes this project will make to all of the above, That being said, we have always understood that the area behind her home is zoned for condominiums or apartments, and we were not too unhappy with the original proposal for the site which would have been condominiums similar to those to the west across Peterson Road. They would have consisted of only 76 units and would have been fairly low-rise, so that they would have allowed our mother and the other homeowners on the South Side of Stonesthrow View to still see at least some of their original views. It also appeared that they would have attractive landscaping and be relatively pleasing to look at from her balcony and windows.

It has come as somewhat of a shock to find that this new project consists pf six three-story apartment buildings which will consist of a total of 144 apartments, that two of these buildings will be directly behind her home, and that mostly all she will be able to see, once they are built, will be the back side of two three-story buildings, with little chance of any other view. We are also deeply concerned about other issues having to do with the proposed traffic lane and parking spaces between the houses on the south side of Stonesthrow View, including her home, and the apartment complex.

Here are our concerns and our recommendations. In many cases we fully agree with the concerns and recommendations of Mr. Biernacki, but we wish to respectfully add other comments, or additional comments of our own,

1. LOCATION AND APPROPRIATENESS OF THIS LOCATION

    - We fully concur with Mark Biernacki's opinion that the size of this complex, height and style of the buildings is very different from any other housing units in this neighborhood and does not fit in. We agree that housing complexes of this type fit in better with high density housing nearer commercial areas, such as those off Tutt Blvd.
    - Such a location would be more convenient for affordable housing residents--within easy walking distance from shopping, affordable restaurants, and bus stops.
    - If the project is kept at this site, PLEASE consider fewer units and lower building heights (or staggered heights as suggested by Mark

Biernacki) so that our Mother and her closest neighbors can keep at least some of their view!

2) PROPOSED TRAFFIC LANE AND REAR PARKING LOTS

- TRAFFIC LANE: The only planned entrance to the proposed apartment complex is though the east-west traffic lane at the back of the proposed complex—directly behind our Mother's back yard and those of her neighbors. This will cause a great deal of traffic noise and congestion right behind where our Mother and others are living quietly in the daytime and sleeping at night.
- We respectfully ask for other entrances to be added, to ease congestion, and efforts be made to add more plantings and an earthen berm, for sound mitigation, per Mark Biernacki's suggestion
- PARKING SPACE ISSUES: We are especially unhappy about the planned row of parking spaces on the north side of the traffic lane—directly behind our mother's back fence and those of her neighbors. Every time a car enters or leaves a space at night, their headlights will shine directly into the bedrooms of my mother and her neighbors.
- SAFETY, SECURITY, HEALTH ISSUES: We are especially concerned that this parking lot location at the back of the lot, out of sight from the front of the complex and manager's offices, will not only end up being a location for leaving inoperative vehicles to sit and and parking RV's, but will become a place where residents and others may linger to have a smoke, a drink, a fix, an impromptu party or even a fight, (Sadly this happens at many apartment parking lots in our city).
- The results for our mother and her neighbors would most likely be trash tossed in their back yard-- bottles, fast food containers, cigarette butts, even used needles. But there could also be loud or raucous conversations or parties keeping them awake at night, or even fights with gunshots that go astray. It is our firm conviction that apartment parking lots should be in front of the buildings in well-lit areas that can be better monitored by managing staff and nearby first responders--not in back of the complex.
- We respectfully request that consideration be given to our security concerns and to the possibility of moving the extra parking to

somewhere in front of the complex. But if not, PLEASE consider putting the parking spaces on the south side of the east-west drive so that they face the apartment buildings, not the homes of our mother and neighbors.

3) TRAFFIC SAFETY—BOTH WIHIN THE COMPLEX AND ON NEARBY ROADS

- We concur with all of the comments and suggestions Mr. Biernacki made on this subject—including the problems with emergency access, and the need for signs and speed bumps.
- However, we wish to add our concern that potentially as many as 144 cars or more going in and out of the Flats at Sand Creek project every day will add a great deal of traffic to an area that is already much busier and more congested than it once was. It will add many cars entering North Carefree via Pony Tracks, or onto Peterson Road from the complex's East-West access drive—neither of which locations currently has a traffic light. North Carefree is already very busy with a lot of traffic, including buses, from the high school as well as the Maverik station and Starbuck's. Peterson is busy as well and both streets experience a fair number of speeding cars every day.
- Drivers speeding around the curve on Peterson Rd from the north may not have time to see cars coming out of the apartment complex access drive in time to slow down or stop,
- We are also aware, when we spend evenings or overnights with our mother, that we can hear a lot of speed racing going on along North Carefree past the school, which could be dangerous for apartment residents exiting the complex via Pony Tracks at night. All the extra apartment traffic will add to the danger of students and residents needing to cross busy North Carefree to get and from to school, Maverick convenience store or Starbuck's.

4) OTHER ITEMS

- Again, for the most part we will defer to Mr. Biernacki's list of other concerns regarding building elevations, parking lot and building lighting, the current poor condition of Pony Tracks Road, and other questions for Lincoln Ave. Capital previous projects. We concur with all of these.

5)EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED APARTMENT COMPLEX ON PROPORTY VALUES AT STONESTHROW

We did not see this mentioned in Mr. Biernacki's comments and have no way of knowing if others have already mentioned it—and perhaps it seems obvious. But we feel we must mention the fact that the building of this apartment complex directly behind Stonesthrow is going to have a bad effect on the property values in the neighborhood. It will especially lower the values of the homes on the south side of Stonesthrow View—including our Mother's. These homes currently have extra value because of their beautiful views. The entire Stonesthrow neighborhood is attractive to buyers because it is a peaceful quiet neighborhood of mostly older citizens, and the homeowner's association keeps it green and well-tended. It is hard to say what the exact effect of having a large apartment complex so close will have, but we feel certain that should our mother want ot need to sell her home someday, if the only view from her balcony and windows is to be the back sides of two three-story apartment buildings and a parking lot, it is not going to appear as desirable to buyers as it would now.

We truly hope at least some things can be done to make this at least a somewhat better situation for the homeowners in Stonesthrow.

Thank you, Mr. Cooper, for your and the city's consideration of our concerns and requests. If you have any questions please contact Stacy Smith @ librarylady1982@gmail.com.

Sincerely,

Lanelle Bensenberg (LMB Living Trust), himeowner

Stacy L Smith and Lori K. Bennett (daughters)

Cooper, Austin P

From: Vickie McKinney <vmlace@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, September 15, 2024 3:25 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Plans for Peterson Rd and N Carefree Cir

Mr. Austin Cooper,

I have a question regarding the planned 144-unit multi-family development at the corner of Peterson Rd and N Carefree Cir. For 144 units, I guestimate there will need to be parking for at least 200 to 250 cars. Where are these people going to park? In the neighborhood in front of our houses or along both sides of Pony Tracks Drive. Also, will they be forced to park in the Sand Creek High School parking lot or at Starbucks. What if they have company? How will parking for handicapped be handled? People won't be able to park on Peterson Road or N Carefree Cir. If the new tenants park in both directions on Pony Tracks Drive, it will impact our ability to enter or leave our neighborhood.

Years ago my husband and I lived by a high school football field. When a football game occurred, people parked in front of our house, including blocking our driveway so we couldn't get into our driveway or leave if we needed to leave the house. That was primarily on Friday nights. If there is not enough parking for the planned apartment complex, I see this happening in our neighborhood everyday.

When we were looking at some apartments 10 years ago, one of the complexes did not have enough parking for their current tenants, much less adding more cars for potential new tenants. Even though we liked the apartment, the lack of parking prevented us from renting the apartment. We found a complex down the road from that complex that offered more parking.

Another concern is does Colorado Springs have enough water to cover all these new apartment complexes all over Colorado Springs and maintain the current residents of Colorado Springs?

The traffic can already get bad now in this area during morning rush hour because of Sand Creek High School especially during the school year. Adding the apartment complex at the planned location will make morning rush worse.

Please reconsider approving the 144-unit multi-family development. There are already 2 new complexes at Marksheffel and Constitution and multiple on Tutt. Do we really need a new apartment complex on a smaller plot of land at Peterson Rd and N Carefree Cir.

Ms. Vickie McKinney

Cooper, Austin P

From: shanna583@aol.com
Sent: Friday, October 11, 2024 4:16 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Sand Creek Flats Development

Hello Mr. Cooper,

There is a meeting coming up regarding the Sand Creek Flats development in my neighborhood. You are listed as the case manager taking questions. I have some questions which are below.

How will the new apartments affect traffic in the area?
How will parking be managed for both residents and guests? Will parking overflow into existing neighborhood streets?
What is the target demographic?
Will these be affordable housing, market-rate, or luxury units?
What is the expected population increase due to these apartments?
What is the expected timeline for construction?
How will construction activities be managed and minimized so disruption to existing communities is minimal?
How might the new construction impact property values in the neighborhood?
Will there be any changes in property taxes due to the new development?

Please let me know if you have any questions.
Thank you,
Shanna Magnuson

Cooper, Austin P

From: Kimberly Moore <kimberlymoore193@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 13, 2024 10:05 AM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Re: Flats At Sand Creek Development DEPN-24-0133

Good morning, hope all is well.

If possible, can you advise what questions to ask and/or evidence would be best to bring to this meeting to show support as to why the neighborhood is against the building of this property?

Our neighborhood is concerned that a decision has already been made to all the property to be built and this just a formality session to show we are given a say.

Also do you know why the housing development, which is already there, did not build past its current location and not utilize that space?

Thanks

Sent from my iPhone

> On Oct 3, 2024, at 1:58 PM, Cooper, Austin P <Austin.Cooper@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:
>
> Good afternoon,
>
> I am writing to inform you that the applicant will be hosting a neighborhood meeting regarding this project. The information for the meeting can be found below and in the attached postcard that will be sent to the surrounding area. I will be in attendance to monitor the meeting and answer any process related questions but this will primarily be a time to discuss the project directly with the applicant team.
>
> The meeting is being held on October 22, 2024, at 5:30 to 7:00pm at Sand Creek High School Cafeteria – 7005 N Carefree Circle, Colorado Springs, CO 80922.
>
> Best,
> <image001.png>
> **Austin Cooper** (he, him, his)
> **Senior Planner** North Team
> Land Use Review Division
> City Administration Building
> 30 S. Nevada Ave., Suite 705
> Colorado Springs, CO 80903
> Office: (719) 385-2226
> Why Pronouns?

Links:
Planning & Community Development Home
Look at Applications Online (LDRS)
Pre-Application Meeting Request

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

<Flats at Sand Creek-Postcard 10.22.24.pdf>

Cooper, Austin P

From: Bailey <bailey.lewis87@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 14, 2024 12:26 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: DEPN-24-0133

Dear Austin,
The residence near this potential building site do not want affordable housing built here. This is right across from a high school and close to an elementary school. We already have rising crime in the area and this will inevitably make things worse and decrease all of our housing prices. This is not the appropriate area to build something like this.

Sincerely,
Bailey Longo

Sent from my iPhone

Cooper, Austin P

From: Mark Biernacki <mark.biernacki58@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 15, 2024 11:37 AM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Cc: Mark Biernacki
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek (DEPN-24-0133) - Comments on property line buffer requirements -

Hello Mr. Cooper,

Thank you for arranging the neighborhood meeting of Oct 22 between the project applicant and us property owners. Our HOA has met to discuss various aspects of the plan and will be present to make various comments and requests of the applicant as to the site plan.

One request in particular will be for the placement of an opaque fence near the northern property line, in addition to enhanced landscaping beyond the number of plants currently indicated on the plans. I note that a Mr. Stachon in Planning suggested such a fence is not necessary based on the premise that there is an existing fence and evergreens along the property line negating the need for an opaque fence (Comment ID 10, Page 4).

We respectfully request the City reconsider this comment. The fence that exists is of an open, split rail design. The evergreens that do exist lie along only a 20-25% portion of the entire northern property line. In our view, these existing conditions clearly do not allow for a sufficient visual/sound buffer and that the inclusion of an opaque fence and enhanced landscaping is not only optional, but very necessary as well.

Thank you,
Mark Biernacki
4255 Stonesthrow View
8157393111

Cooper, Austin P

From: David Schneider <rockbug63@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2024 7:48 AM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek

This development at the corner of North carefree and ponytrax is without a doubt the worst idea I have seen in a long time. My house and surrounding neighborhood has been inundated since the sale of the golf course the thousands of apartments built up within a mile of me including Constitution Barnes and Mark sheffle antelope ridge area.We see it as a continuing devaluation of our neighborhoods and the quality of life in this what used to be desirable neighborhood. Look at the number of housing units for sale in our ZIP code of 80922 and you can see that people are running away from this area. Required Green space allocation per square foot of development is being ignored and the congestion in this area has grown to the point of breaking. I totally reject this plan and all associated massive development in this area. David Schneider 4181 ascendant drive

Cooper, Austin P

From: Mark Biernacki <mark.biernacki58@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 19, 2024 2:54 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Cc: Mark Biernacki; John Tinan
Subject: Some more zoning related questions on Flats at Sand Creek -DEPN-24-0133

Hello Austin, it's me again.

I took a deep dive into the Unified Development Code over the weekend. This generated some additional questions regarding the Flats at Sand Creek project. I was wondering what might be some of your thoughts on the following:

Access and Connectivity 7.4.404.2d
This project's northeastern access off of Pony Tracks conflicts with this provision's prohibition on multi-family projects accessing local streets that primarily serve single family and two family residences in residential zoning districts including the PDZs to the north and the east. Shouldn't this require a site plan redesign with entrances only off of Carefree and Peterson? If not desirable from an engineering perspective, would this at least give adjoining property owners leverage to request, and the City to require, that the proposed northeast entrance be eliminated and instead relocated further to the south along Pony Tracks where there is currently proposed a break in the retaining wall?

Property Edge Landscape Buffer 7.4.906.b(1)2
As a follow-up to my previous email on the need for an opaque fence along the northern property line, this section requires such a fence to be 7 feet in height. Given the extraordinary level of new traffic that will be added to the back of the Stonesthrow Subdivision , and that our homes are at a higher elevation than the subject property, such a fence will do little to screen our view of the project. Accordingly, we are going to request that such a fence be at least 8 feet in height, in addition to what we previously communicated is a need for additional trees to match what was proposed for the site's former approved project. Further, these trees should have a minimum height at least 8 feet at the time of planting. In time, there would be a very effective fence/tree combination screen reaching as high at 15-20 feet.

Parking Lot Landscaping 7.4.907.b.2.b
In looking at the site plan, it appears the northern edge of the northern parking spaces does not comply with the perimeter parking lot fencing and landscape screening requirement to screen auto headlights, glare, etc. Also, you may recall that we are requesting the perpendicular spaces be relocated to the south side of the new east-west road with the parallel spaces on the new road's north side.

Additional Interior Landscaping 7.4.908.b.1.a.(1)
This project does not comply with this section given the applicants have requested a variance of 50%. Somewhere on the comments sheets, I believe I saw a city comment that agrees with this variance finding that neighborhood parks in the vicinity are an adequate trade-off. I cannot find in the code where such a variance is allowed using such a finding. However, it is instructive to look at the requirements for

"compact development lots" (of which this is not - see b.2.b), where a 25% (not 50%) departure can be granted if a park is within 660 feet and is directly accessible from the project by a trail. For this project, the closest neighborhood park is about 2500 feet in driving/walking distance to the north and is not directly accessible by any trail. A quasi park/detention area is 2600 feet to the east. And the High School ballfields (even if usable by the general public are not readily accessible given the need to cross Carefree) are 1200 feet to the south. Do you have some thoughts on how the variance request versus these standards/conditions can be reconciled?

General - Building Height and Placement

Do you feel any site plan revisions to meet these and the various other city comments will result in the applicant proposing 4-story instead of 3-story buildings? I understand there can be a lot of give and take and we would not want to see this project go any higher than 3 stories (ideally, 2 stories would be best, but we have to be realistic, I know). With that said, if taller buildings are proposed, can the taller buildings be placed to the south with the shorter buildings to the north? Does the City have leverage to require such a south to north transition?

I look forward to any thoughts you may have on the above. And, thank you, Austin, for your continued patience in answering my many questions about this project. It is very much appreciated by me and my fellow homeowners in the Stonesthow at Springs Ranch subdivision.

Sincerely,

Mark Biernacki
4255 Stonesthrow View
8157393111

copy: John Tinan, Stonesthrow at Springs Ranch HOA Board President

Cooper, Austin P

From: Julie Lence, Historical Author <julie.lence.author@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2024 2:04 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Project #: DEPN-24-0133; Colordo Springs

Dear Mr. Cooper:
As a resident of Colorado Springs, in the Springs Ranch neighborhood, I am disheartened to learn of plans to build an affordable multi-unit apartment complex at the intersection of Peterson Road and North Carefree Circle. The addition of approx. 150-300 cars to an already overtaxed intersection is a poor decision on your office and the city's part. Between Sand Creek High School, Starbucks and the addition of duplexes and single family homes on North Carefree Circle, ranging from Tutt Blvd to Marksheffel,this past year, I cannot imagine why you would want to continue to overburden residents. Perhaps it's because you don't live in the area and experience the nightmare every morning of trying to get out of Springs Ranch and onto main roads and hope you can provide a reasonable explanation at tomorrow night's meeting, along with how the addition of these units will affect property values, an influx of students at Sand Creek High School, Springs Ranch Elementary School and Remington Elementary. Is the city able to afford adding on to these schools to make room for new students, without raising taxes? And what about the wear and tear on the roads. Will the city keep cover the costs of necessary repairs? Or will taxes be raised? Also, with the addition of these units, just how does your office and the city account for an escape plan should a natural disaster occur. Colorado Springs has developed routes for neighbors to evacuate, but have you considered just how much longer it will take for people to evacuate after adding these units?

I look forward to your answers regarding these and other questions tomorrow evening.

Sincerely,
Julie Lence

Cooper, Austin P

From: Lisa Sims <lisamsims15@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2024 3:59 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Pony Tracks/N. Carefree/Pederson Development Proposal Questions

Austin,

Please redirect this email if you are not the correct recipient for the questions pertaining to Development Proposal on Pony Tracks, Colorado Springs. I am submitting the following questions for response for the Oct. 22nd meeting at 5:30 PM.

1. Pony Tracks is a mid-high traffic use outlet for the neighborhood, what provisions will be put in place to ensure there is not an increased influx of cars, resulting in an issue to evacuate in an emergency?
2. With a multi-family build, according to the proposed plan, there is only one parking stall per unit, where will overflow park?
3. Pony Tracks has a very slick decline near the intersection of Pony Tracks/N. Carefree during the winter/snow, with increased traffic this WILL pose a hazard to cars and pedestrians, how will this be managed differently with the proposed multi-family unit building with the outlet for the build being the onset of the slick area?
4. If the builders/affordable housing developers do not maintain the property or if there is an issue with residents, who is proposed to take on the management, and financial oversight of the area?
5. If there is increased traffic to the surrounding neighborhood because of the multi-family build, who will contribute to the financial costs for repavement of roads and sidewalks for the area?
6. The surrounding community was not given notice by the HOA, was the HOA notified?
7. What if any contributions will be made to the schools to accommodate the higher population of students at the nearby schools, which are already suffering from a decrease in teachers?
8. What is the expected impact on the community regarding start to completion? The community is currently affected by the road construction on Pony Tracks causing increased delays in commute.
9. What data can you provide to show why this build is being considered for this area/neighborhood versus other areas or currently unoccupied land/new build areas?
10. This build will adversely affect the property value of the surrounding neighborhood, if that can be disputed, can you provide data to reflect that the neighborhood will not be harmed by the affordable housing?
11. What type of oversight/management/security/additional policing are you willing to enforce in the instance that there are issues due to the new build?

12. What are the long-term goals for this development?
13. What is the architectural style of the buildings, and how will they complement existing homes?
14. What is the plan for maintaining and managing the property?
15. Who will qualify to live in the affordable housing units?
16. If this build goes forward, what is the projected timeline for construction, and what are the hours of operation? Will there be any measures taken to reduce noise, dust, and other construction-related disturbances?
17. Is this build already cleared to take place and this meeting just a formality?

I appreciate any feedback and getting this to the appropriate responder if you are not the correct person.

Regards,

Lisa

Cooper, Austin P

From: S Lov <cameroloverz@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2024 6:43 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Cc: SHAWNEE M. CTR USSF SSC SSC/CGM LOVATO; Steve Lovato; S Lov
Subject: Project #DEPN-24-0133 Homeowner Concerns

Project #: DEPN-24-0133

Project Manager: Austin Cooper Email: austin.cooper@coloradosprings.gov

Mr. Cooper,
Good evening we are home owners and will be attending tomorrow's meeting in regards to the Carefree Apartment complex they are wanting to build on the corner of North Carefree and Pony Tracks.

As homeowners we have a lot of concerns and the sign stated to send you any questions we have by 22 Oct. Below see below:

-------NOTES/ CONCERNS----------

- Why is this suitable for this location?
- Lack of infrastructure (sewer, electricity, water) how does this plan play in with the current set up can the current infastructure support an additional 144 units
- Safety for Pedestrian crossing
    - Will a crosswalk be put in?
    - Will a light at Pony tracks and North Carefree be added?

- Traffic Impact already issue with U-turn from school, school zone, high school traffic and other traffic, what is the plan to accomidate with the increase of drivers
- Parking only for 144 cars most will have 2 cars so where will 288 cars park? The plan is only for 144 parking spots most families will have 2 drivers and 2 vehicles
- Across the street from a flood zone, what will be impact on our water and sewage now/5years/10 years down the road
- Crime Impact
- What is the vetting process for who lives in “Affordable Housing” what’s the definition of Affordable Housing, schools within 5-mile radius
    - Who will be allowed to rent
    - Who is intended population

- What will happen when the apartments are flipped?
    - What will be the standard for this?
    - Will you keep same standard for renting the units how can you assure this when these are flipped?
- Who is the builder?
- Why were we not given a fair opportunity for current residents to attend this meeting or HOA.
    - Lack of information was sent out and lack of notice for time to attend meeting
    - Not everyone in this area drives by the lot or seen the small sign why wasn't information pushed out to all who currently live in this neighborhood

    - Was the hope to sneak this meeting under the door so no push back was given?
    - Something this big needs to be sent out to ALL residents ALL homeowners
- Lottering already an issue with school, how will you make sure it doesn't increase?
- 144 units means 144 families that are renting and not owning most residents own and therefore care about their property homes and neighborhood renters will not care like homeowners do, how can your renters keep the standards high for our neighborhood?
- Value of properties will be affected and will go down?
- Affect school population, what will be done?
    - Sand creek had a growth of 9 percent and a decrease of 9 percent of teachers
    - Create better school system is already an issue with lack of teachers and inflex of students this will add to issue already fighting

- What will be the fire / Catastrophe / Exit plan
- Has a study been done considering the current traffic, AND the future traffic.
    - ADDING in all current building projects within a 5-mile radius not just this project
    - If not your not considering the true traffic issues that current residents will face
- Has the city considered that pony tracks are already dangerous in the winter and adding traffic and parking on this section of the street is going to cause more dangerous driving conditions in bad weather?
- Who will be taxed for the roads, the roads in neighborhood are bad now, who will fix them down the road. Currently the city is just patching roads, still just as bad who will pay for the fixes in the future? The taxpayers?

Steve and Shawnee Lovato
4074 Ascendant Dr
719-505-2066

Cooper, Austin P

From: LINDA SHOWERS <showersl@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, October 21, 2024 7:34 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Comments on DEPN-24-0133

First, it is ludicrous that the traffic study was conducted during the summer when Sand Creek high school was not in session. The study included a single data point from April 2021, barely a year after the COVID pandemic lockdowns began, with no assessment of the status of the school at that time - were students in class or doing online learning? Homeschooling? What percentage of each? In any case, it is highly likely not an accurate representation of activity during the school year today.

The traffic study needs to be re-accomplished, when school is actually in session, to adequately assess the traffic in the area. I have seen students crossing the uncontrolled (only stop signs on Pony Tracks) intersection at Pony Tracks and North Carefree either on foot or in vehicles, late for class, running or gunning it to get across six lanes of traffic. The intersection is outside of the school zone...and with the increased traffic from this development, someone is going to get hurt or killed. Additionally, the fact that all traffic leaving the proposed development heading west, south or east will be using the uncontrolled intersection of Pony Tracks and North Carefree was not evident in the study.

Also, this proposed 'affordable housing' development backs up to a number of quiet patio homes - many occupied by seniors. This is a bad combination - mixing low income tenants with multiple elderly residents within a few feet. The existing folks likely can't move to get away from the coming noise, congestion and indifference of a 500 additional people.

As a resident of The Knolls, the amount of high-density residential development within about a mile or so of this development is already appalling! It seems the city planners want to cram as many bodies per square foot as possible...without regard to traffic, noise, safety or quality of life - either for the existing or the new residents. This lot was slated to become a church back when we moved here in 2005...what happened to that?

I am 100% against this project proceeding...how about another car wash (since the promised church didn't work out)?

Cooper, Austin P

From: Jeremy Hoffman <kandjhoffman@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2024 9:12 AM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Neighborhood Meeting for Flats at Sand Creek

To: Austin Cooper,

We are residents in The Knolls at Spring Ranch and live yards away from the development site. We have concerns about what it would do to our home to have 144 apartments built just yards away.
In our neighborhood we have low water pressure and how much would that be affected by adding 144 apartments with their own toilets, showers, washers, and dishwashers are being used.
We live right across from the Sand Creek high school and there is traffic congestion when leaving or entering the neighborhood when school is starting or getting out also during school events and adding 144 apartments will definitely add to that congestion being able to leave and enter our neighborhood.
Right now we have a beautiful view of the mountains and if there are tall apartment buildings built there that view will definitely be diminished or gone altogether.
There are not very many green spaces around this neighborhood anymore and there are many apartments with in a 1 mile radius of us.
These are just a few of many concerns of how this apartment complex will affect the quality of life for all the residents in our neighborhood.

Sincerely,
The Hoffmans

Cooper, Austin P

From: Nancy Stoltenberg <stoltenberg38@q.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2024 3:09 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek

Hello,

Here
are our thoughts regarding the proposed “Flats at Sand Creek”

-
-
- Added intersection
- congestion. This is already a really busy intersection, especially as Markshuffell gets busier North Carefree has gotten much more congested. I travel by this area when Sand Creek students are let out for the day and the area is very busy with students crossing
- at that intersection and a large volume of cars. With the added cars and driveways this area would become unsafe for those students and put their lives more at risk.
-
-
-
- It does not fit with
- the overall look and feel of the community as well. All of the houses and condos are 2 stories tall and something like this would dramatically stand out against the landscape instead of fitting in with the long standing established community.
-
-
-
- Impact on health and
- wellbeing of the community. There is a pathway that has great views of Pikes Peak that the entire community can use for their health and wellbeing. With this proposal it would impact that view and make the area much less peaceful and more boxed in and crowded.
- Open spaces are needed for communities to thrive and feel connected to nature.
-
-
-
- Impact on mountain
- views for home owners that have lived in the community for many years. Many people bought their homes with that view believing it would always be there. It impacts the resale value of their home as well as their own health and wellbeing.
-
-
-
- The schools in this
- area are already dealing with a large influx of students. Having to utilize modular buildings would add more strain to those schools.

-
-
-
- Understand there is
- a need for affordable housing but is this truly the best location for it? Many jobs are in the central and western parts of the city. And there is a lack of access to resources like libraries. The closest are 15 to 20 minutes drive away.
-
-
-
- Just because something
- is okayed to be built by how it is zoned doesn't mean it should be built and that it is what is best for the entire community as a whole now and in the future.
-

Nancy
and McKayla Stoltenberg

Cooper, Austin P

From: Reynolds, Alan C <alan.reynolds@optum.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2024 9:58 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Development Proposal at N Carefree and Peterson

Hi,
Were you the gentleman at the meeting, representing the city?
I am the fellow in the green vest that interrupted the meeting.

My opinion:
This comes down to a very simple matter of money.
If one takes out racial, ethnic, or religious bias, the bottom line is, some people are of afraid of those that have less money than they do. They believe that the discrepancy, necessarily leads to increased crime.

The questions on infrastructure, and traffic, I feel were not biased at all.

This is simple NIMBY.

I hope that this is helpful.

Regards,

Alan Reynolds
Greenways North Resident
719-314-5229

Cooper, Austin P

From: Young, Nyla J <nyla.young@optum.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2024 7:38 AM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Sand Creek Flats

Hi Austin
Thanks for the meeting last night regarding the proposed development of Sand Creek Flats; it got a little heated so we left before it was over. I do have a few questions that I was wanting to ask and wondered if you could help direct me to the answers.

1) What is / where would I find out if there is history of crime changes after developments like this in the city?
2) How will this impact our property values?
3) Could you tell me where the other developments are that were created by this developer? And if there is any research that was done for them that you know of, please share that link.
4) Is this the only website for the project? Where would we find the public comments/responses?
5) Do you know why a church or projects of less density did not come to fruition?
6) Why was the lot changed to high-density without notice to those of us living nearby? Or did I miss it? I would have thought there would be a public meeting about that, too.

Comment: I agree with the lady that spoke about how some homeowners rent to less than desirable tenants and that it sounds like Ben is doing all he can to make sure the tenants of the project would be good neighbors, but would like to see considerably less people in that location. As many mentioned, it is unsafe at that intersection to try to cross the road even now and traffic backs up past that intersection at certain times of day already.

Thank you for all you do. We appreciate your efforts.

Kenan & Nyla Young
7035 Hillock Drive, Knolls HOA neighborhood

Questions/Comments/Requests by the Stonesthrow at Spring Ranch Homeowner's Association

Neighborhood Meeting on the proposed Flats at Sand Creek Apartment project
October 22, 2024
Sand Creek High School Cafeteria

I. John Tinan, HOA Board President

Overview and introduction of the HOA's interests, requests, and concerns.
Introduce/recognize other Stonesthrow owners in attendance

II. Mark Biernacki, Stonesthrow Property Owner

A. General

1. Please describe the "affordable" aspects of this project
   - -Will there be use of tax credits, incentives, other?
   - -What percentage of the total units to be "affordable"?
   - -What will the Income ranges of the tenants be to be eligible for reduced rents?
   - -What will be the length of time/term the units are to remain affordable?

2. Please outline Lincoln Avenue Capital's experience in developing other similar projects
   - -Have they built similar projects in Colo Springs or elsewhere that we can visit?

3. Who will be the on-site management company?
   - -What is their track record?
   - -What other projects in Colo Springs or elsewhere do they currently manage that we can visit?

B. Site Plan Related

1. Screening from north property line
   - -Code requires 7 ft opaque fence plus landscaping, but will do little to screen the project
   - -Extraordinary circumstance (extra traffic, height of our homes, etc) should require more
   - -We welcome further discussion with developer to come up with an effective solution

For now, we request the following:

Fence

- -Request an 8ft opaque fence running the entire length of the north property line
- -Fence to be set 10-15 feet south of and parallel to the north property line
- -Molded rock-type taupe-colored plastic with brick pillars every 50 feet
- -Examples exist along Tee Shot, Peterson, and Carefree

Landscaping

- -Previously approved project had 51 trees proposed. This project proposed only 28
- -Request 50 plus trees having at least 8 feet of height at the time of planting
- -Increase the percentage of trees to be evergreen variety
- -Request tress to be planted on the north side of the 8ft opaque fence
- -Area to be rocked with visqueen underlayment and drip irrigation lines installed at each tree

2. Traffic and Access

-Request re-design to help disperse traffic away from our homes

-Can a grand entrance be provided off of Carefree?

-If not feasible engineering-wise, can an additional or relocated access be created further to the south on Pony Tracks where there is currently a proposed break in the retaining wall (again, to create a more notable grand entrance to/from the project)?

3. Parking

-We question the utility of those parking spaces off of the new e/w drive lane

-How will they be policed to ensure inoperable vehicles, trailers, etc. cannot be parked there?

-Flip the design of these spaces. Perpendicular spaces facing south, parallel spaces to the north

4. Buildings Design and Placement

-Are other creative architectures being considered? Are there examples of this elsewhere in Colo Springs?

- More creativity in design, mix of 2 and 3 stories, articulated facades?

-What color schemes are being considered?

-Transition: Please place taller buildings to the south and shorter, 2 story buildings to the north

-How will Fire Dept's concern about retaining wall proximity affect placement of bldgs 2,3,and 4?

-What will be the FFE of the bldgs (for us to assess the effective height relative to our homes)?

5. Other Matters

-It is our understanding that the requested 50% variance from on-site interior open space requirement will not be approved. How will this affect the current placement of buildings, parking, etc?

-Please ensure all lighting to be directed away from our homes

-There is a fox den on the property. Please ensure relocation of foxes prior to construction

III. John Tinan, HOA Board President

Conclusion and summary

Cooper, Austin P

From: Reynolds, Alan C <alan.reynolds@optum.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2024 1:33 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: RE: Development Proposal at N Carefree and Peterson

Good afternoon Sir,
Thank you for responding.

I had some additional thoughts. Again, purely opinion.
To seek or obtain 'buy in' from the surrounding community, the developer might consider this question, jointly, from the community: " What is in this development for me?".

Respectfully,

Alan Reynolds
CES Client Advocate
Payment Integrity Client Care
T- 1-800-765-6818 Option 2
Client Support Portal : Optum Payment Integrity Software Support Portal
Support Box: cessupport@optum.com
Optum

From: Cooper, Austin P <Austin.Cooper@coloradosprings.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2024 1:28 PM
To: Reynolds, Alan C <alan.reynolds@optum.com>
Subject: RE: Development Proposal at N Carefree and Peterson

Good afternoon Alan,

Thank you for your comments. They will be forwarded to the applicant and I will keep you in the loop with any progress the application makes including when they make a resubmittal that will include a neighborhood comment response letter.

Best,

Austin Cooper (he, him, his)
Senior Planner North Team
Land Use Review Division
City Administration Building
30 S. Nevada Ave., Suite 705
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
Office: (719) 385-2226
Why Pronouns?

Links:
Planning & Community Development Home
Look at Applications Online (LDRS)
Pre-Application Meeting Request

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: Reynolds, Alan C <alan.reynolds@optum.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2024 9:58 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P <Austin.Cooper@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Development Proposal at N Carefree and Peterson

Hi,
Were you the gentleman at the meeting, representing the city?
I am the fellow in the green vest that interrupted the meeting.

My opinion:
This comes down to a very simple matter of money.
If one takes out racial, ethnic, or religious bias, the bottom line is, some people are of afraid of those that have less money than they do. They believe that the discrepancy, necessarily leads to increased crime.

The questions on infrastructure, and traffic, I feel were not biased at all.

This is simple NIMBY.

I hope that this is helpful.

Regards,

Alan Reynolds
Greenways North Resident
719-314-5229

recipient or intended recipient's authorized agent, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete this e-mail immediately. This e-mail, including attachments, may include confidential and/or proprietary information, and may be used only by the person or entity to which it is addressed. If the reader of this e-mail is not the intended recipient or intended recipient's authorized agent, the reader is hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender by replying to this message and delete this e-mail immediately.

Cooper, Austin P

From: Aaron Schick <aaron1.schick@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 23, 2024 2:32 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek Project

Hi Austin,

Good talking with you today regarding this project, here are a few bullet points regarding our position against this project.

- Classic homes has already rammed a giant housing project into this zip code that is going to grow the 80922 population by 17%-19% - This is hardly finished and we are still reeling from the lies and let downs from City Council and all elected officials.

- North Carefree and Peterson innersection is already very stressed from having a giant high school(Sand Creek) nearby as well as new inlets and outlets from the still not finished and highly traffic generating building project (greenways at sand creek) that was NOT supposed to happen. This is what Classic homes told us and then did otherwise. Faith in city council and the mayor is also depleted due to back filling and infilling projects that stress the already breaking roads.

- 144 Units is FAR too much for this 7 acre space - It will just be another giant building with parking all around. WE have to do a better job of representing the already existing tax payers and NOT the builders who just want to make more money by securing the green light from our once fine city council.

- What about matching the existing landscape and not drag down the area? By putting in low cost housing that will be owned by an outside company and export all those rent dollars as well as lower the average house value in the area.

- This is standard brand degradation to an area - You first built nice houses and a golf course - then tear down the golf course and put in low cost single and multi family units and now the goal is to put in low cost 144 unit housing - This is LOWERING the average value in the area and screwing us the tax paying citizens - Standard brand degrading and handing your loyal long time tax base out to dry! Please zone this something different - anything you want - but just choose one that ends by adding value to the town.

Thanks Austin! - Aaron Schick

Cooper, Austin P

From: Reynolds, Alan C <alan.reynolds@optum.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2024 11:42 AM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Subject: RE: Flats at Sand Creek DEPN-24-0133

Hi Mr. Cooper,
I understand all of the documentation.

I have been holding back, but I am going to opine, honestly.

First, background. I am 68 years old, American born, of African descent, a college graduate.

Once upon a time, I was the same 'subsidized/low-income/affordable' housing prospect.
I grew up in the lowest rated school district in Suffolk County (Wyandanch, NY), on Long Island in the 60's/70's.

As an adult, on Long Island, I could afford the second lowest rated school system in Suffolk County, (Brentwood, NY). I have lived 'white flight'.

However, I am also privileged. I graduated from Pomfret School in 1974 and Boston University in 1978.

Therefore, I have seen this movie before.

The bottom line of this project is, 'it scared the white people'.

Remember, if all other cultural, non-financial biases are removed, the people are concerned with the composition of their community and their property values.

I live in Greenways North. I never imagined spending what I have for a home.
However, my circumstances aligned and my wife and me are here.

The developer has a lot of work to do to assuage the community' concerns.

Respectfully,

Alan Reynolds
CES Client Advocate
Payment Integrity Client Care
T- 1-800-765-6818 Option 2
Client Support Portal : Optum Payment Integrity Software Support Portal
Support Box: cessupport@optum.com
Optum

From: Cooper, Austin P <Austin.Cooper@coloradosprings.gov>
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2024 10:38 AM
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek DEPN-24-0133

Good morning everyone,

I apologize for flooding you with emails but the applicant has resubmitted the project and including a letter in response to the public comments received (see attached). I am including THIS LINK again so that you may view the resubmitted plan by entering the record number (DEPN-24-0133) in the search bar.

Best,

Austin Cooper (he, him, his)
Senior Planner North Team
Land Use Review Division
City Administration Building
30 S. Nevada Ave., Suite 705
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
Office: (719) 385-2226
Why Pronouns?

Links:
Planning & Community Development Home
Look at Applications Online (LDRS)
Pre-Application Meeting Request

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

Cooper, Austin P

From: Mark Biernacki <mark.biernacki58@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2024 4:34 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Cc: STV-A & J Gilbert; STV-AlCarol; STV-Ann; STV-Barb; STV-Caroline Thompson; STV-David; STV-Doc; STV-DonSilva; STV-Doreen; STV-EdDeb; STV-J & J Kistler; STV-Jeff; STV-Jerry; STV-JoAnn; STV-John Lisa Tinan; STV-Judy; STV-Kathleen; STV-KenSherry; STV-Lars; STV-Lesa; STV-Linda; STV-LindaM; STV-Mark B; STV-Marsha; STV-MaryKay; STV-Michelle; STV-Mike; STV-OtisAnne; STV-Peggy; STV-Ray; STV-Roger; STV-Ron; STV-Sherri; STV-Sue; STV-Sund; STV-Susan N; STV-Tom Jiron; STV-Vicki
Subject: Lincoln Ave Partners existing project at Interquest and Federal and its application on property at Carefree and Peterson
Attachments: IMG_7342.jpg; IMG_7340.jpg; IMG_7341.jpg; IMG_7344.jpg; Screenshot (162).png; IMG_7345.jpg; IMG_7347.jpg

Hello Austin,

I don't know if you have ever had the opportunity to look at Lincoln Ave Partner's existing project at Interquest and Federal (Interquest Ridge Apartments). If not, I encourage you to do so. I took a drive by this project today and it reinforces my and my neighbors' view that the proposed Flats at Sand Creek project is just too dense for the Carefree/Peterson location.

The first five of the attached pictures are of this existing project. The rep from Lincoln Ave Partners told me these are the types of buildings that are proposed for the Carefree/Peterson site. The rep also said that this existing project has a density of 20 or so apartments per acre, the same density as what is proposed at Carefree/Peterson.

The last two pictures are of the vacant Carefree/Peterson site. The one picture with the street light standard (which is 40 - 50+/- feet tall?) gives a good reference as to how this 38-foot tall project will look and operate.

I can now envision how the bulk and height of these 3 story buildings will impact the surrounding neighborhood and the adjacent streets that will have these too tall and too bulky buildings looming over them. It would be an "urban" look in the midst of a suburban, low density setting.

While the Interquest site is appropriate for the type of project and product they like to build, it is wholly inappropriate for the proposed site. There is simply nothing like it along Peterson from a point one mile south all the way north to Dublin.

As I said in my original comment letter of Sept 6, multi-family projects having this high level of density are better placed in areas serving as a transition between intensive regional commercial uses and low density residential uses. The apartments along Tutt adjacent to First and Main and points north come to mind. Multi-family projects such as this proposed high density one do not belong at Carefree and Peterson.

We will continue to assert this position while working with the developer on our various site design concerns. These concerns exist regardless of what will be the eventual density, height, and bulk of this project.

I would like to discuss this with you further. In particular, how staff will evaluate this project relative to the review criteria they must follow, especially subparagraph C from the list you sent earlier today.

I'll call you sometime next week.

Sincerely,

Mark Biernacki
4255 Stonesthrow View
8157393111

Cooper, Austin P

From: thehyde@juno.com
Sent: Thursday, October 24, 2024 5:30 PM
To: Cooper, Austin P
Cc: joe@yemiformayor.com
Subject: Flats at Sand Creek

Hi,
After attending the meeting (10/22/24) to address concerns with this project going forward, we were told to e-mail you with our displeasure with this project (Flats at Sand Creek).
We will be directly affected by this project by the increased Traffic, Noise, People Traffic, and increased strain on the School System.
Will the residents be part of the HOH - to guarantee the quality of my community?
Every piece of land does not have to have something built on it- it is ok to leave open land

Once again WE are against this project- we have worked hard and have earned the right to our quality of life not being destroyed by this project... Plus we are doing this for our pets that enjoy "their field."

Thank you for your Time,

Heidi Freeman