



THE PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT APPEAL TO CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Complete this form if you are appealing an **Administrative** decision to City Planning Commission.

APPELLANT CONTACT INFORMATION:

Appellants Name: Ian Kallenbach Telephone: (719) 238-5246
Address: 8111 Valli Farm Rd. City: Fountain
State: CO Zip Code: 80817 E-mail: ian.kallenbach@gmail.com

PROJECT INFORMATION:

↪ Not assigned to my knowledge

Project Name: _____
Site Address: 1425 Winding Ridge Terrace, Colorado Springs, CO 80919
Type of Application being appealed: Notice of Violation and Order to Abate
Include all file numbers associated with application: Case # 2010054
Project Planner's Name: Sean Cope (and Mitchel Hammes)
Hearing Date: _____ Item Number on Agenda: _____

↪ Not assigned yet

↪ not assigned yet

YOUR APPEAL SUBMITTAL SHOULD INCLUDE:

1. Completed Application
2. \$176 check payable to the City of Colorado Springs
3. Appeal Statement.
 - See page 2 for appeal statement requirements.

Submit **all** 3 items above to the **Land Use Review office (30 S Nevada, Suite 105, Colorado Springs, CO 80903)**. Appeals are accepted for 10 days after a decision has been made. Submittals must be received no later than 5pm on the due date of the appeal. Incomplete submittals and / or submittals received after 5pm or outside of the 10 day window will not be accepted. If the due date for the submittal falls on a weekend or federal holiday, the deadline is extended to the following business day.

If you would like additional assistance with this application please contact the Land Use Review office at 385-5905.

APPELLANT AUTHORIZATION:

The signature(s) below certifies that I (we) is(are) the authorized appellant and that the information provided on this form is in all respects true and accurate to the best of my (our) knowledge and belief. I(we) familiarized myself(ourselves) with the rules, regulations and procedures with respect to preparing and filing this petition. I agree that if this request is approved, it is issued on the representations made in this submittal, and any approval or subsequently issued building permit(s) or other type of permit(s) may be revoked without notice if there is a breach of representations or conditions of approval.


Signature of Appellant

3/22/21
Date

THE APPEAL STATEMENT SHOULD INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING

- If you are appealing a decision made Administratively the following should be included in your appeal statement:
 1. Verbiage that includes justification of City Code 7.5.906.A.4
 - i. Identify the explicit ordinance provisions which are in dispute.
 - ii. Show that the administrative decision is incorrect because of one or more of the following:
 1. It was against the express language of this zoning ordinance, or
 2. It was against the express intent of this zoning ordinance, or
 3. It is unreasonable, or
 4. It is erroneous, or
 5. It is clearly contrary to law.
 - iii. Identify the benefits and adverse impacts created by the decision, describe the distribution of the benefits and impacts between the community and the appellant, and show that the burdens placed on the appellant outweigh the benefits accrued by the community.

Appeal Statement is attached. See Addendum A.

CITY AUTHORIZATION:

Payment: \$ _____

Date Application Accepted: _____

Receipt No: _____

Appeal Statement: _____

Intake Staff: _____

Completed Form: _____

Assigned to: _____

Mr. Ian Kallenbach's Appeal to the Notice of Violation and Order to Abate

(Addendum A)

March 22, 2021:

I received a Notice of Violation and Order to Abate on March 16, 2021 (Addendum F) stating that it was created on March 10, 2021 and that I need to submit an appeal, if I wanted to appeal, by March 20, 2021, 10 days from the creation of the document, not the receipt.

I. The Notice cited the following code as being violated.

7.5.1702.B: SHORT TERM RENTAL UNIT PERMIT REQUIRED: "The short term rental unit permit does not run with the property, but is issued to the specific owner of the property. The permit shall expire upon sale or transfer of the property. The permit shall not be transferred or assigned to another individual, person, entity or address but may be managed by a third party on behalf of the owner."

The Notice was a written declaration of what I was verbally told over the phone in the second half of January 2021 by Mr. Mitchel Hammes, Neighborhood Services Manager.

II. It is my hope that after you read the sequence of events that you will see that what has happened to me is *against the express intent of the zoning ordinance (2)*, and that it is *unreasonable (3)* to penalize families for protecting themselves from lawsuits caused by renting their property to tenants while also trying to organize their affairs in case of a death in the family.

It is also my hope that you will see that throughout this process, I've tried to be in compliance with the intent of the code and follow the direction of Mr. Hammes only to my, and my family's, detriment. You will see three times that I have been promised one thing by the City officials only to be led into a scenario that has injured my family and denied us the ability to gain legal assistance and comply strictly with the law. I ask that you make right these incidents, by granting my appeal and allowing me to follow through on the resolution that Mr. Hammes wrote to me was acceptable on Nov 13, 2020, as otherwise, situations like these cause distrust among citizens trying to comply with the intent of the code and work with city officials to come to resolutions.

III. The benefits and adverse impacts created by the decision, the distribution of the benefits and impacts between our community and me (the appellant), and the burdens placed on me (the appellant) that outweigh the benefits accrued by the community:

Mr. Hammes had called and emailed me to tell me that a complaint was filed by my neighbor - a neighbor who Mr. Hammes described as very vocal to the code enforcement department. The neighbor claimed I had sold my property and therefore was in violation of city code.

I explained to Mr. Hammes that I had not sold my property. I told him that in order to mitigate risk to myself, my wife, and my family from tenants falling, tripping or injuring themselves or others on my property, as well as for estate planning purposes, I moved the property into an LLC, of which my wife and I are ultimately the sole owners, just as we were the sole owners of the property before the LLC. I explained to Mr. Hammes this is a very common practice for people who long or short term rent properties to limit liability from guests and organize their estate and legal affairs.

I sent Mr. Hammes evidence that demonstrates that the property is ultimately not controlled by any other entities or owners besides those who have always owned it - myself and my wife.

Then, Mr. Hammes asked me if I wanted to elevate the issue to his boss for further review, given the obvious conflict of the code regarding its intent, which was to not assign the rights of the short term permit to a new owner after a sale, and the problems it was causing homeowners like myself who had done the same thing to protect their families and organize their legal affairs in case of death.

Mr. Hammes agreed that my response made logical sense and said that it would benefit him to gain clarity around this matter, as well as help other homeowners like me. Mr. Hammes recently (March 18, 2021) told me that the city was "sitting on five other cases like mine."

In November 2020, when he asked me to elevate the issue, I was concerned that the act of elevating this would cause further problems, especially because there was no solution on the table between Mr. Hammes and me.

Mr. Hammes then affirmed to me that if I simply moved (by quit claim deed) the property back to my name and my wife's that there would be no further action taken by Code Enforcement or the City and that I had satisfied their intent with regard to the city code.

I was still resistant to elevate the issue until Mr. Hammes affirmed that we had unequivocally satisfied Code Enforcement by moving the property back into our names. He said we will be compliant to the code if we move the property back into our names. I agreed to move the

property back, but I still was worried that I'd be taken advantage of if he pressed the issue further with city officials. Mr. Hammes seemed very interested in getting a better resolution to this matter because he agreed that my wife and I fulfilled the *intent of the code* and that this was a loophole that he was shocked was not dealt with when the code was written in the first place. He told me he doesn't even remember it being brought up.

He offered a solution, "Ian would you like me to write you saying the same thing? Would that make you feel more comfortable?"

I said, yes, writing it to me would make me feel comfortable. I said, please write that to me, and then give me 24 hours to determine if I'd like to elevate the issue. I was moved by the fact that it would help other homeowners in my situation, as well as there might be a chance that I'd be able to keep the property in the LLC if his boss agreed, which I knew would protect my wife and I and other homeowners from liability while properly arranging our legal affairs, while complying to the code.

So, Mr. Hammes wrote an email to me, on Nov 13, 2020, stating:

"As we discussed, the simple solution is to put the property back into your own name and then compliance with the City Code has been achieved. There is no penalty or punitive measures at that point and the matter will be considered resolved as compliance with the City Code has been achieved." (Addendum B)

On the same day, I wrote Mr. Hammes back:

"Hey Mitchel, I'm willing to move it back into my name. So long as we have that resolution on the table and it is agreeable, I'd like for you to take it up with the other city officials to see if I could keep it in the LLC. As I mentioned on the phone, due to a refinance, I will likely be moving it back in the next week or so anyhow.

For estate planning purposes and liability, many of your citizens will likely do as I have done. They likely already have. They might even put it in a Living Trust or Irrevocable Trust.

Mortgage companies have "due on sale" clauses that technically require a change in ownership to mean that a mortgage is "due on sale." However, 99.9% of the time, that is not acted upon because the mortgage is being paid, which is what they really care about, and because the practical ownership hasn't really changed.

If the original owners are the same as the manager and its members, it is effectively the same. I like my structure and would like to keep it, but I'd rather keep my VRBO permit. :) Thanks again for being reasonable and working toward a solution." (Addendum C)

The way Mr. Hammes positioned talking to the City Attorney was that I was doing him and the City a kindness by letting them clarify their position, but that everything was resolved with my property. He told me he'd get back to me in 2-3 weeks.

Then, around January 20, 2021, about 9 weeks later, Mr. Hammes tells me that the City Attorney and Planning Director plan to revoke my permit as a violation of the 7.5.1702.B code.

From what Mr. Hammes explained to me, the intent of the code referenced above was that the grandfathered permit does not transfer to new owners, if the property is sold.

In my case, the property was not sold to any other unrelated party. My wife and I owned and controlled the property, and still own and control the property.

However, by forcing us and other short term rental owners to move it from a LLC - though we were and are willing to do so to comply strictly with the code as it is written - we would lack important legal protections and estate arrangements should something happen to either or both of us.

I agree that short term rental permits should not transfer to new owners and controllers of properties, and that the intent of the code was to protect our community from that scenario. I think that exposes our community to unwanted risks, but that is not what happened in my case.

The code, as it is written, is not intricate enough to address the reality (legal, insurance, estate, etc.) of homeowners who rent their properties.

It is unreasonable and over-reaching to ask short term rental owners to not have the benefit of the legal protections that LLCs offer. By refusing short term rental owners the ability to place their properties in LLCs, you are putting them in a Catch-22, which I do not believe was your intent: Either expose yourself to frivolous lawsuits brought about property and casualty liability and loopholes in 3rd party company contracts like homeowners' insurance, AirBnB, and VRBO online contracts or don't rent your property to other people on a short term basis. Either rent your property with lots of liability to many people you have never met before, to include guests of your contracted guest, or don't rent your property.

That was not your intent, correct?

That seems like an unreasonable demand on the citizens of Colorado Springs.

Lastly, even to appeal the Notice of Violation, I was told at least two more things that are not coming true. Mr. Hammes recognized that due to COVID certain sections of City Planning was not open so he told me in a phone call on March 18, 2021:

“Ian, we want to work with you and make sure this is as fair as possible, so even if you get your appeal in by next Friday [March 26, 2021], we’ll accept it.”

Given what I’ve gone through, I did not trust him telling me that. Also, my lawyers told me that they could not write this appeal by March 20, 2021 (which is a Saturday, so according to the code, it moved the due date to today, Monday, March 22, 2021).

This is from my attorneys:

“None of the attorneys have capacity to have this done by Monday. If you can get confirmation in writing that the deadline can be extended to Friday, March 26, we would be able to have the form and letter completed by that time. Please let us know how you would like to proceed.”

While I’ve paid hundreds, perhaps over one thousand dollars, to gain counsel through this process, I was not going to be able to have them actually do the work to appeal this Notice.

So, I wrote Mr. Hammes on Friday, March 19, 2021 at 2:47 pm, to ask that he write down what he told me.

“Mitch, you mentioned that if it is not in by Monday, which is the end of the 10 days, that you all would extend it to Friday next week. Will you please write that to me.

You also mentioned that we’d plan on May 20 [This is in reference to the revocation hearing date. I had told him that I was out of town April 10-18 and asked that we push for May 20, 2021, because he told me that would work and that they’d be flexible]. Will you please confirm that?”
(Addendum D)

Then, Mr. Hammes replied this morning, March 22, 2021 (the due date) at 8:57 am with:

“I am very sorry for any confusion that I may have caused in my attempts to be accommodating, as I was mistaken in my understanding of the appeal procedures. Upon review of City Code requirements, the period for submitting the appeal is ten calendar days, or the following business day if the tenth days falls on a non-business day. Therefore, your appeal will need to be submitted to Senior Code Enforcement Officer, Sean cope by the end of business today (5pm).

Sean is out unexpectedly today, so as long as he receives the appeal submission by the end of the day today, he can have a planning technician call you to make payment tomorrow.

In so far as scheduling, again, I was mistaken and am very sorry. City Code Section 7.5.906 requires the hearing to take place a minimum of twenty days (20) and a maximum of forty eight days (48). I included this code section in the email of March 18th. My understanding is that you may submit a request for an extension to the planning commission in writing, although an extension is not automatic. You may appear at the hearing virtually as the planning commission has been hosting virtual meetings for quite some time now.

I am truly sorry for any confusion our conversations by phone may have caused you. Neighborhood Services does not deal with appeals to the planning commission very often, and myself even less (as the code enforcement officers are the primary contacts). Going forward, I will ensure everything I convey is accurate before disseminating and will do so in writing via email as you have requested.” (Addendum E)

If I had not written to Mr. Hammes, you would not be reading this appeal.

This process has left me without being able to legally protect my family and my property while short term renting my property, as well as expose my estate to unnecessary complications. The code, as it is written, is unreasonable in its denial of homeowners’ desires to protect themselves legally, and it is penalizing me and any others in our community, even though I am operating within the intent of the code, as evidenced by my emails and conversations with Mr. Hammes. The interaction between property owners and the city has also been unreasonable and has deterred, and you could maybe go so far as to say prevented, me from receiving the legal representation I was willing to pay for to appeal the City’s Notice.

Short term rentals provide a service to guests to our community, as evidenced by their popularity, and they also provide vital income to families, like mine, who depend on these rents to feed their families and pay their mortgages, especially during tough times like we have experienced the past year during the COVID pandemic. I’ve spent years developing this short term rental to be able to help provide for my family. I even have a staff member who is paid to assist in maintaining the property. Disrupting that by revoking my permit does not benefit our community. In fact, it will injure my family, and other families like mine, as well as cause other members of our community to be laid off from their work in support of families like mine.

I could have and, looking back, should have called the City before I moved the property into a LLC. If I am guilty of something, it is ignorance. I was not aware or did not remember that section of the code. The moment I was asked to move it back to our names, was the moment I was willing to and agreed, as evidenced by my emails with Mr. Hammes. The reason I did not

immediately do it after that email, was because Mr. Hammes told me he'd get back to me within 2 weeks and that I might be able to keep it in an LLC. He told me it was not necessary that I immediately move it, but that I should wait for him to get back to me. I was also waiting for the refinance I mentioned in the email to occur, and it was delayed (it has not happened). Mr. Hammes did not get back to me until his office created his Notice of Violation on March 10, 2021, about 7 weeks after our phone call on or around Jan 20, 2021.

I ask that you appeal this Notice of Violation and do one of the following:

1. Consider this matter resolved and the short term permit revocation appealed, if I return the property ownership to my wife's and my names, given that was the City's decision via Mr. Hammes, in-writing, and given that I always meant to operate within the intent of the code. Also, all this decision would mean to our community is that the property will continue as it has. There is no added disruption to our community by allowing it to continue as-is. This act would also build trust between citizens communicating and working with the City to enforce the code. That trust has been broken by this interaction.
2. Allow me to keep the property's ownership in the LLC, given that my wife and I are ultimately in control and ownership of the LLC. This provides the protection we desire for our family, as well as the legal planning to be responsible spouses and parents. We fully understand that the property in question cannot be sold to another party of which we are not the full and complete owners and controllers.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ian Kallenbach', written in a cursive style.

Ian Kallenbach



Addendum B
Ian Kallenbach <ian.kallenbach@gmail.com>

Colorado Springs Short Rental (1425 Winding Ridge Terrace)

Hammes, Mitchel <Mitchel.Hammes@coloradosprings.gov>
To: Ian Kallenbach <ian.kallenbach@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 13, 2020 at 2:51 PM

Hi Ian,

Thank you for taking the time to speak with me about this situation. As we discussed, the simple solution is to put the property back into your own name and then compliance with the City Code has been achieved. There is no penalty or punitive measures at that point and the matter will be considered resolved as compliance with the City Code has been achieved.

I am happy, and will plan to carry this issue forward to our City Attorney and Planning Director for a definitive interpretation of our City Code's language regarding ownership change of a property to an LLC with the same sole member/manager as the original STR permit applicant. I will let you know when a direction is decided. Please feel free to call or email me with any questions. Thank again for being willing to discuss this matter and work cooperatively to find a mutually beneficial solution.

Sincerely,

Mitchel Hammes, Neighborhood Services Manager

City of Colorado Springs

30 S. Nevada Avenue, Suite 701

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

(719) 385-5583 office

mitchel.hammes@coloradosprings.gov

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]

3/22/2021

Gmail - Colorado Springs Short Rental (1425 Winding Ridge Terrace)



--

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information, including patient information protected by federal and state privacy laws. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution, or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message.

[Quoted text hidden]

3/22/2021

Gmail - Colorado Springs Short Rental (1425 Winding Ridge Terrace)



Ian Kallenbach <ian.kallenbach@gmail.com>

Colorado Springs Short Rental (1425 Winding Ridge Terrace)

Ian Kallenbach <ian.kallenbach@gmail.com>

Fri, Nov 13, 2020 at 3:28 PM

To: "Hammes, Mitchel" <Mitchel.Hammes@coloradosprings.gov>

Hey Mitchel, I'm willing to move it back into my name. So long as we have that resolution on the table and it is agreeable, I'd like for you to take it up with the other city officials to see if I could keep it in the LLC. As I mentioned on the phone, due to a refinance, I will likely be moving it back in the next week or so anyhow.

For estate planning purposes and liability, many of your citizens will likely do as I have done. They likely already have. They might even put it in a Living Trust or Irrevocable Trust.

Mortgage companies have "due on sale" clauses that technically require a change in ownership to mean that a mortgage is "due on sale." However, 99.9% of the time, that is not acted upon because the mortgage is being paid, which is what they really care about, and because the practical ownership hasn't really changed.

If the original owners are the same as the manager and its members, it is effectively the same. I like my structure and would like to keep it, but I'd rather keep my VRBO permit:) Thanks again for being reasonable and working toward a solution.

Ian

[Quoted text hidden]

3/22/2021

Gmail - Appeal to Planning Commission

Addendum D



Ian Kallenbach <ian.kallenbach@gmail.com>

Appeal to Planning Commission

Ian Kallenbach <ian.kallenbach@gmail.com>

Fri, Mar 19, 2021 at 2:47 PM

To: "Hammes, Mitchel" <Mitchel.Hammes@coloradosprings.gov>

Mitch, you mentioned that if it is not in by Monday, which is the end of the 10 days, that you all would extend it to Friday next week. Will you please write that to me.

You also mentioned that we'd plan on May 20. Will you please confirm that?

Thank you.

Ian

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]



Ian Kallenbach <ian.kallenbach@gmail.com>

Appeal to Planning Commission

Hammes, Mitchel <Mitchel.Hammes@coloradosprings.gov>
To: Ian Kallenbach <ian.kallenbach@gmail.com>

Mon, Mar 22, 2021 at 8:57 AM

Good Morning Mr. Kallenbach,

I am very sorry for any confusion that I may have caused in my attempts to be accommodating, as I was mistaken in my understanding of the appeal procedures. Upon review of City Code requirements, the period for submitting the appeal is ten calendar days, or the following business day if the tenth day falls on a non-business day. Therefore, your appeal will need to be submitted to Senior Code Enforcement Officer, Sean cope by the end of business today (5pm). Sean is out unexpectedly today, so as long as he receives the appeal submission by the end of the day today, he can have a planning technician call you to make payment tomorrow.

In so far as scheduling, again, I was mistaken and am very sorry. City Code Section 7.5.906 requires the hearing to take place a minimum of twenty days (20) and a maximum of forty eight days (48). I included this code section in the email of March 18th. My understanding is that you may submit a request for an extension to the planning commission in writing, although an extension is not automatic. You may appear at the hearing virtually as the planning commission has been hosting virtual meetings for quite some time now.

I am truly sorry for any confusion our conversations by phone may have caused you. Neighborhood Services does not deal with appeals to the planning commission very often, and myself even less (as the code enforcement officers are the primary contacts). Going forward, I will ensure everything I convey is accurate before disseminating and will do so in writing via email as you have requested.

Sincerely,

Mitchel Hammes, Neighborhood Services Manager

(719) 385-5583 office

mitchel.hammes@coloradosprings.gov



3/22/2021

Gmail - Appeal to Planning Commission

From: Ian Kallenbach <ian.kallenbach@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 19, 2021 2:48 PM
To: Hammes, Mitchel <Mitchel.Hammes@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Appeal to Planning Commission

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

[Quoted text hidden]

<p>CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS, STATE OF COLORADO Code Enforcement Administrator Address: 30 S Nevada Ave, Mail Code 730 Colorado Springs, CO 80903</p>	
<p>TO:</p> <p>1425 WINDING RIDGE TERRACE LLC 1425 WINDING RIDGE TER COLORADO SPRINGS CO, 80919-1061</p> <p>AND OCCUPANTS OR OTHER PERSON WITH AN INTEREST IN THE PROPERTY KNOWN AS:</p> <p>1425 WINDING RIDGE TER COLORADO SPRINGS CO, 80919-1061</p> <p>RESPONDENT</p>	<p>Tax Schedule Number 7311103038 Case Number 2010054</p>
<p>NOTICE OF VIOLATION AND ORDER TO ABATE</p>	

WHEREAS, it has been made to appear to the Code Enforcement Administrator, City of Colorado Springs, State of Colorado that 1425 WINDING RIDGE TERRACE LLC, owner of 1425 WINDING RIDGE TER, COLORADO SPRINGS CO, 80919 ("Respondent"), has violated the Code of the City of Colorado Springs 2001, as amended ("City Code") §7.5.1702.B: SHORT TERM RENTAL UNIT PERMIT REQUIRED, as follows:

- I. On November 13, 2020, Code Enforcement received a complaint regarding change of property ownership, in violation of the short-term rental ordinance for the property located at 1425 WINDING RIDGE TER, COLORADO SPRINGS CO, 80919 ("Respondent"), zoned PUD HS (Planned Unit Development with a Hillside Overlay) Single-Family Residential.
- II. On March 10, 2021, Neighborhood Services conducted research to determine property ownership for 1425 WINDING RIDGE TER, COLORADO SPRINGS CO, 80919. This research of public records, recorded with El Paso County Assessor, indicate change of property ownership occurred on July 17, 2020. This is in violation of the Code of the City of Colorado Springs 2001, as amended ("City Code") §7.5.1702.B: SHORT TERM RENTAL UNIT PERMIT REQUIRED.

Respondent is in violation of City Code § 7.5.1702.B: SHORT TERM RENTAL UNIT PERMIT REQUIRED: which states; "The short term rental unit permit does not run with the property, but is issued to the specific owner of the property. The permit shall expire upon sale or transfer of the property. The permit shall not be transferred or assigned to another individual, person, entity, or address but may be managed by a third party on behalf of the owner."

YOU ARE HEREBY ADVISED that abatement of these violations is your responsibility.

NOW THEREFORE, you are hereby advised to bring the property into compliance by ceasing short-term rentals at this property; meet the standards and apply for an owner occupied short term rental permit; or change the rental duration to long-term (30-days or more). Failure to make these changes within **10-days** of this notice will result in the initiation of short-term rental revocation process as outlined in City Code §7.5.1707.

Suspension or revocation or non-renewal of a permit may be in addition to any remedy provided for in this chapter, including but not limited to, the remedies provided in section §7.5.1005 of this article. (Ord. 18-112) of the Code of the City of Colorado Springs 2001, as amended, to include civil action in the District Court for injunctive relief to abate violations of this Zoning Code and the Subdivision Code of this chapter.

IF YOU WISH TO CONTEST this Notice of Violation and Order to Abate, you must file an appeal in accordance with City Code §7.5.906 within 10 days of receipt of this Notice of Violation and Order to Abate. Appeals shall be filed with the Planning and Development Department, located at 30 S. Nevada Ave., Suite 701 Colorado Springs, CO 80903.

If you have any questions regarding this NOTICE, please contact Senior Code Enforcement Officer Sean Cope at (719) 499-4051 or via e-mail at sean.cope@coloradosprings.gov

DONE THIS 10th day of March 2021.

FOR THE CODE ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATOR



Sean Cope #5671, Senior Code Enforcement Officer