

Les Gruen

April 26, 2017

**By Electronic Mail and U.S. Mail**  
*(Lthelen@springsgov.com)*



Lonna Thelen  
Principal Planner  
City of Colorado Springs  
30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 105  
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Re: **Archer Park - 4<sup>th</sup> Submittal**

Dear Lonna:

As you are aware, Urban Strategies, Inc. represents the Broadmoor Northstar Homeowner (Mayfield Lane) Association, a variety of neighbors along El Encanto Drive as well as the Albert's, who own the two properties contiguous to the subject site on the east. This letter is a formal response to the applicant's "4<sup>th</sup> submittal" for the Archer Park project.

We note the applicant's request that this item be considered at the May 18<sup>th</sup> City Planning Commission meeting. We also note, staff, in its review of this application, has identified a number of concerns that have yet to be addressed. Chief among them are serious questions pertaining to drainage and utility service issues that are discussed in greater specificity below.

The neighborhood has no objections with this item going to Planning Commission as soon as possible. However, it is unrealistic to expect concerned citizens to respond to this application by April 27<sup>th</sup> when such serious outstanding drainage issues have not been addressed.. Drainage concerns are especially important in light of the current EPA lawsuit against Colorado Springs regarding the City's alleged mishandling of stormwater. At the very least, the Planning Commission should not be reviewing this matter until the applicant's drainage report has been thoroughly vetted by the City's engineering department to assure compliance with all City requirements and that all relevant plans and analyses have been made publically available for review and comment.

Likewise, concerned citizens have not been provided with substantive answers to how Archer Park would be served by utilities. The neighborhood's lawyers believe the applicant is not able to utilize existing easements as proposed for the reasons outlined below. The applicant suggests its lawyer is comfortable with the use of existing and/or proposed easements for utility service, but provides no evidence that in any way supports this conclusion. The city attorney's office has yet to weigh in on this matter and should do so prior to this project being submitted to Planning Commission.

An objective review of the 4<sup>th</sup> submittal for this project, suggests it is not ready to move forward to the Planning Commission.

### **Figure 7 - 4th Submittal Neighborhood Comments**

As indicated above, major unresolved concerns are:

Utilities. The proposed final plat incorrectly refers to some of the existing easements as “Existing Utility Easements” and “Existing Non-Exclusive Easement.” The “Existing Public Utility Easement” shown on the plat is recorded in Book 22 at Page 98. This is an easement reserved in a 1877 deed for an irrigation canal for the benefit of the Colorado Springs Company. It cannot be used for any other purpose. The “Existing Non-Exclusive Easement” is a 1968 easement granted to the Broadmoor Sanitation District for a sewer line serving 12 El Encanto. Other than connecting up to two sewer taps from property to the west, no other uses can be made of it. The existing 20’ access easement is a private (not public) access easement for the benefit of 12 El Encanto. Any installation of utility lines or other construction activity within the easement requires the prior approval of the owner of 12 El Encanto, and cannot disrupt the continuous right of access to 12 El Encanto, which currently has a tenant living there. As a practical matter, this precludes any utility installations within the private access easement other than connecting a maximum of two (2) sewer taps to the existing sewer line pursuant to the 1968 easement.

The applicant’s 4<sup>th</sup> submittal fails to include an updated utility plan showing how water, sewer, gas and electric services will be provided. This is essential detail to understand this proposal. Obviously, if this service is proposed to use any of the above three easements, establishing the right to do so must be a pre-condition to any approval of the proposed plan. The applicant has not even requested approval for use of the private 20’ access easement as required by that easement. The unsupported statement by the applicant’s planner that the applicant’s “attorney has reviewed all correspondence and finds that ALC’s plans do not violate any existing [sic]” does not change the provisions and restrictions in the written and recorded easements. Please refer to Bruce M. Wright’s January 17, 2017 letter to you enclosing copies of the recorded easements, which is attached for your convenience. Until the applicant can establish they have the right to use any of the existing easements, or create new alternative utility easements within their property sufficient to bring required utilities to the site, they have not established how utilities are to be provided, making any review by the Planning Commission premature. (The Northstar Homeowner Association has indicated it will not permit utility access through its property.)

Drainage. No mention or provision for off-site flows entering the property from the southwest has been made. Both the 1987 Broadmoor Northstar Subdivision drainage report (which the applicant’s drainage report claims “accounted for these flows”) and the City’s current FIMS database show these flows currently entering the property from the southwest, yet no provision has been made for how these flows are to be conveyed through the property to an appropriate outfall point as required by the City’s Drainage Criteria Manual. Using current City drainage criteria, the 100-year storm offsite flows will be 28.3 cfs, which when added to the 18.9 cfs the report states will be generated onsite, means the total 100-year storm flows through the property will be 47.2 cfs, or *two and a half times* the capacity of the proposed drainage improvements,

Lonna Thelen  
Principal Planner  
City of Colorado Springs  
April 26, 2017  
Page 3

virtually guaranteeing failure of on-site stormwater mitigation measures and the inundation of adjacent properties with overflowing flood waters in any significant storm. (Neighbors have already shared their experiences of overflowing streets during significant stormwater events.) Further, the grading plan, as presented, fails to tie into existing grades and it is impossible for my clients to understand and evaluate the practical effects of the applicant's grading and drainage plans.

Additionally, the proposed drainage plan still shows the detention pond discharging storm water onto Mayfield Road. Mayfield Road is a private road, and the homeowners association owning this road has previously indicated to you the association will not allow storm water from this project to be discharged onto its road. Unless the applicant obtains the required consent to discharge storm water onto Mayfield Road, a different method of discharging storm water to an appropriate outfall point will have to be provided before this application can appropriately be considered by the Planning Commission.

These, as well as additional significant drainage concerns, are covered in more detail in my February 6, 2017 letter to you. The 4<sup>th</sup> submittal does not even address, let alone resolve, any of them. We understand that the applicant is eager to have this application heard before the City Planning Commission, however, significant unresolved issues remain and review by the Planning Commission at this time is premature. My clients and I have argued from the beginning of this project that an administrative review of this application is not appropriate due to the controversial nature of the project and developer. Therefore, the notion of the project moving to Planning Commission versus an administrative review makes sense.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the applicant has failed to establish they have the legal right to install the required infrastructure for their project. In addition, it appears there have been serious omissions in accounting for stormwater flow onto the subject site, which requires further study. Until these issues are satisfactorily resolved, we believe more work must be done before referring this submittal to the Planning Commission. In the event these concerns are not suitably addressed, it would be incumbent upon staff to recommend denial of this application as it moves forward.

Please contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Les Gruen

cc: Dr. James Albert  
Bruce M. Wright, Esq.

Diane Matsinger  
Kevin Sullivan

Northstar Homeowners c/o Betty Wolf

**FLYNN & WRIGHT, LLC**  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

PLAZA OF THE ROCKIES, SUITE 202  
111 SOUTH TEJON  
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80903

BRUCE M. WRIGHT  
bwright@fwflegal.com

---

(719) 578-8444

FACSIMILE (719) 578-8836  
FWF File No. 3365.001

January 27, 2017

**By Electronic Mail**

(Lthelen@springsgov.com)

Lonna Thelen  
Principal Planner  
City of Colorado Springs  
30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 105  
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Re: Archer Park - Third Submittal

Dear Ms. Thelen:

This office represents Dr. and Mrs. James Albert who, as you know, own property at 12 El Encanto. We have been asked to comment on the Third Submittal for the proposed Archer Park project. The major concerns are:

Fire. Previous concerns over fire access have not been adequately addressed. As you know, the Alberts will be meeting with Chief Lacey to further address these concerns.

Drainage. Previous concerns over drainage have not been adequately addressed. Actual runoff on the property (including historic upstream flows) will exceed the capacity of the proposed improvements by a factor of 2-1/2 times, virtually guaranteeing catastrophic failure in a major storm. Given the EPA's pending lawsuit against the City for inadequate stormwater control, approving drainage improvements which are virtually guaranteed to fail in a major storm hardly seems prudent. Additionally, while the Applicant states the detention pond overflow direction has "been modified toward El Encanto," all overflows still must be conveyed through Mayfield Lane in order to reach El Encanto. As previously noted, Mayfield Lane is private, so there is no legal right to convey developed flows across Mayfield Lane, absent written consent from owners of property served by that road.

Utilities. As you know, the Alberts are the beneficiaries of a 20' access easement over the easterly portion of the proposed project. The proposed plat and utility plan show a 15' "public non-exclusive easement" and a 5' "Utility Easement" as being located within the 20' access easement. These easements are proposed to be used for sewer and water lines for the

Lonna Thelen  
Principal Planner  
City of Colorado Springs  
January 27, 2017  
Page 2

project (and although not shown, presumably gas and electric lines as well). Such uses are not permitted.

5' "Utility Easement" Recorded in Book 22, Page 98. This is an 1877 deed. It does not reserve or create any public or private utility easements. It only reserves the right of the Colorado Springs Company to maintain and use an irrigation canal for irrigation and domestic water. The irrigation canal has long since ceased to exist. No use other than the irrigation canal is permitted. A copy of the 1877 deed is attached.

15' "Public Non-Exclusive Easement." This is an easement granted to the Broadmoor Sanitation District in 1968 for the sewer line serving the historic Enoch residence at 12 El Encanto. The only permitted use is for the existing sewer line, and enlargement of that line is not permitted. However, up to two sewer taps for land immediately to the west of the easement are allowed to be connected to the sewer line. A copy of this easement is also enclosed. As successors to the Enochs on 12 El Encanto, this easement now runs to the benefit of the Alberts. No other use is permitted under this easement.

The existing 20' access easement for the Alberts does not allow for installation of utilities or activities which would disrupt use of the easement for access. Thus, unless the Alberts are willing to modify their existing access easement, that easement cannot be used for water, gas, electric and/or sewer lines (other than the two sewer taps that are allowed to be connected to the existing sewer line). Consequently, the proposed plat and development plans must be modified to relocate those utility lines so they do not encroach onto the Alberts' existing 20' access easement.

We trust this information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely,



BRUCE M. WRIGHT

BMW/gad  
Enclosures

cc: Dr. James Albert  
Les Gruen  
Jon Steeler, Esq.



Received at 2:37 o'clock P.M. MAR 21 1963  
Application No. 594314 HARRIET BEALS

BOOK 2224 PAGE 380

RIGHT OF WAY DEED

KNOW ALL MEN BY THESE PRESENTS. That DAVID W. ENOCH and ELLEN M. ENOCH, of the County of El Paso, State of Colorado, in consideration of the sum of Ten Dollars and other valuable consideration, do hereby grant, bargain, sell and convey unto BROADMOOR SANITATION DISTRICT, of the County of El Paso, State of Colorado, its successors and assigns, the following-described real estate in El Paso County, State of Colorado, to-wit:

THIS INSTRUMENT IS  
FILED IN BOOK 2224  
PAGE 380  
*Done*

A temporary construction easement and right of way 30 feet in width, 15 feet on each side of the described centerline, with a permanent non-exclusive easement and right of way 15 feet in width, 7-1/2 feet on each side of the described centerline, over, across and under a tract of land owned by the grantors, said centerline being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at the Northwest corner of Lot 9, Block 1 in Sierra Vista Estates Subdivision, thence running Easterly along the North boundary line of said Lot 9 a distance of 157 feet to the point of beginning of said centerline; thence angle right 91° 42' 30" and run Southerly a distance of 296 feet to a point on the Southerly boundary line of said Lot 9.

Said easement and right of way is conveyed for the purposes of laying sewer pipe and the construction, maintenance, operation and repair of said sewer system, including the right to enter said premises at any time for such purposes. No buildings or other structures, except telephone and power lines, fences, shrubs, trees and other landscaping, shall ever be erected upon the surface of said easement and right of way.

Upon completion of said construction and any subsequent maintenance or repair thereof, the grantee shall backfill all trenches and excavations and compact the same and shall restore the surface of said easement as nearly as possible to its original condition prior to the commencement of such construction, repair or maintenance. The roadway at the North end

*Harriet Beals*

Figure 7 - 4th Submittal Neighborhood Comments

of said easement shall be regraded and graveled and the road at the South end of said right of way shall be graded and resurfaced with blacktop where such blacktop now exists. The surface of said easement between the gravel driveway on the North and the blacktop drive on the South shall be reseeded with wild grass, and any fruit trees which may have to be moved shall be replaced, together with any shrubs, bushes or trees which may have been removed or damaged during said construction.

Grantee further agrees to extend two connecting lines Easterly from said District sewer line to the center of the grantors' West driveway to permit connections to grantors' residence. Grantee agrees to permit said connection to the District sewer without charge by the District, but the grantors shall pay the regular connection fee to the City of Colorado Springs. Grantee further agrees to provide two additional free connections or sewer taps to the grantors for the future use of the property immediately to the West of said right of way.

Said right of way passes close to several large spruce trees and other evergreens and in the event of any damage to them during construction resulting in the death of any of said evergreens within one year after construction, grantee agrees to replace the same or reimburse the grantors for their value. Grantee shall replace any shrubs, trees, bushes, curbing and paving damaged by the extension of the two connections to the grantors' West driveway. Grantee shall not permit trucks and other heavy equipment to use the driveway to grantors' residence, and any damage to the blacktop driveway around the residence or along the back road or the gravel driveway adjacent to the easement shall be repaired and resurfaced. Grantee shall avoid piling any dirt on existing trees, shrubs or bushes during construction.





## Thelen, Lonna

---

**From:** Bette Ann Albert <basalbert1@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, April 25, 2017 9:27 PM  
**To:** Thelen, Lonna  
**Subject:** Bette Ann Albert on my response to the latest submission of 10 Archer Park

Hello Lonna,

Mr. Delesk and his land planners have not answered the previous concerns that I submitted on behalf of my husband and me or our neighborhood. He has ignored all of our points and seems to be making up his own set of facts. At this point in the process it is imperative that the City not approve his latest submission for it is deceptive and inaccurate.

My husband and our other experts on this situation will be submitting a detailed response. I hope that you and the City will not approve the latest submission by Ms. Heggam representing Mr. Delesk. None of the issues that are of grave concern to our neighborhood or to our own property are adequately resolved due to the nature of the proposed design plan with 7-8 homes with a detention pond in an already existing neighborhood. The problems are compounded by a one way in and one way out private road that is shared by the Alberts and nothing can be done to the easement without our agreement. The traffic going in and out of this proposed development has been underestimated and the safety of entrance in and out of 12 El Encanto has not been resolved. My husband and I are completely opposed to this proposed development as it is currently planned. If you have been told otherwise, you need to know that nothing has changed on our end for the developer has not addressed all of our concerns nor the neighborhood's concerns for safety.

You have all of my previous concerns and they should not be ignored for they are still relevant to the safety of our neighborhood and our homes and properties at 9 and 12 El Encanto Drive.

This plan as currently proposed will be a disaster for the drainage issues that will certainly develop from the inadequate resolution of the water drainage from this property that have not been adequately resolved and the drainage will affect 9 and 12 El Encanto as well as homes on Mayfield and the south and east end of El Encanto.

I seriously ask that this plan not be approved by you at this point for nothing has been resolved and I believe there is deceptive information being passed to you as truth by the developer and his representatives.

Very Respectfully,  
Bette Ann

## Thelen, Lonna

---

**From:** Nancy Barber <lattegirl1@aol.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 23, 2017 3:49 PM  
**To:** Thelen, Lonna  
**Subject:** Archer park submittal

Lonna,

One of my neighbors forwarded this email to me that they had received from you. Despite my having written to you before and also having signed up to be kept informed, I have not been kept in the loop except for my neighbors' kindness. Subsequent emails sent by other interested parties replying to your latest email refer to a plat map but there was not one attached to this forwarded email. Can you please send me the attachments? Thank you.

I have read numerous comments referring to utilities easements running along the west side of the property. My neighbor to the south and I both have/had utility easements running along the west side (actually my water line went right across the middle of the subject property ) down to the meter by the Broadmoor Elementary school (on Sequoyah near its intersection with Old Broadmoor Rd) My point is that these easements were private ones for water lines only so I question that they are large enough to hold water and sewer and gas for multiple homes. There are also overhead electric lines that run along that easement/lot lines. I would like clarification on this matter and perhaps can get that if I could see the plat maps.

Thank you.

Nancy Barber  
39 Marland Rd

Compassion.com The opposite of poverty is not wealth, but rather, enough.

On Tue, Apr 18, 2017 at 12:59 PM, Thelen, Lonna <Lthelen@springsgov.com> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Attached is the 4<sup>th</sup> submittal for the Archer Park project. Please provide any new comments by April 27<sup>th</sup>. The applicant has requested that they be forwarded to the May 18<sup>th</sup> City Planning Commission meeting. If staff determines that the project is ready for City Planning Commission on May 18<sup>th</sup>, you will be notified of the meeting via email.

Thanks,  
Lonna

Compassion.com The opposite of poverty is not wealth, but rather, enough.

## Thelen, Lonna

---

**From:** Eric Ryan <ERyan@skrco.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 20, 2017 11:54 AM  
**To:** Thelen, Lonna  
**Subject:** 4th submittal

Good morning, Lonna:

I live around the corner from Michael Roslin on Mayfield Lane and I would like to second his well-written summary below related to our neighborhood's concerns related to Archer Park. I will not take the time to restate all of his concerns below as the same concerns of my family, but please note we believe the same issues that we have expressed this past year still apply. In addition to Michael's comments, I will restate once again that the Mayfield private road, which is adjacent to the detention pond, will undoubtedly bear the run-off from the chemicals and debris that will accumulate in the detention pond once heavy storms occur. This is not appropriate.

I believe that you have heard from many people that the proposed number of homes is just too large for the small acreage and I would analogize the proposed development as attempting to fit a square peg into a round hole. It just doesn't work and should not be approved.

Sincerely,  
Eric Ryan  
230 Mayfield Lane

**Eric T. Ryan, CPA**  
**Tax Partner**  
Stockman Kast Ryan & Co. LLP  
102 N. Cascade Ave. Suite 400  
Colorado Springs CO 80903  
Work: (719) 630-1186 ext 304  
Fax: (719) 630-1187  
<http://www.skrco.com>

**CONFIDENTIAL, FOR DESIGNATED RECIPIENTS ONLY:** This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the originator of the message and delete the original transmission and its attachments without reading or saving in any manner.

**FEDERAL TAX ADVICE DISCLAIMER:** We are required by U.S. Treasury Regulations to inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication, including attachments and enclosures, is not intended or written to be used and cannot be used for the purpose of avoiding federal tax penalties. This communication is not intended to be used and cannot be used for the purpose of promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any matters addressed herein.

**From:** Michael Roslin [mailto:michael@frontrangecommercial.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 20, 2017 10:06 AM  
**To:** Thelen, Lonna  
**Cc:** Bette Ann Albert; Dianne Allen; Les Gruen; Diane Matsinger; David W. Donner; Corna Gossage; Paul Eckstein; Betty Wolfe; Whitney Galbraith; Scott Nilsen; james albert; daniel\_schnee@kindermorgan.com; Kelly Sung; Walt Harder; lorenemondo@comcast.net; Robert; Eric Ryan; Amy Moore; Ruth; Neill Erdossy; Norah Roscamp; pd22eckstein@comcast.net; Carrie Dunn Clarke; BILL KOSAR; Duncan Tenney; Fredrick Jones; D Archibald; Powl Smith  
**Subject:** Re: 4th submittal

Hi Lonna,

My wife and I remain opposed to the developers fourth submittal for Archer Park. Our objection to the proposed development is that it in no way is compatible with the existing neighborhood. The proposed density

of homes are too much given the size and shape limitation of the land parcel. Once again, in my opinion, the developer has not adequately addressed the neighborhood concerns. It is unfair and unwise to approve the seven (7) homes on a site that cannot support or has no plans to include curbs, gutters, or sidewalks. I have said the same numerous times, apparently to no avail. It is simply insane to approve a development with a 20-foot wide road, even with the developer's proposed sliver of land to park excess vehicles. It is still a parking lot regardless of how the developer's representative defines or characterizes this. This proposed project is simply a bad idea, the results of which may negatively impact the quality of the neighborhood and my residency. I would urge the developer to reconsider his proposed number of homes and land on a lesser number which will allow for a wider road, curbs, gutters, and sidewalks. If this were contemplated, then the proposed plans could reflect a 30-35 ft wide road, with curbs, gutters, and sidewalks, leaving enough permeable areas for proper drainage, (NOT A DETENTION/RETENTION POND), circulation of vehicles in and out of said development, in addition to providing adequate on-street parking (within Archer Park) and would be a better fit for the existing neighborhood, which I think is stated as one of several conditions for city approval. This project as proposed **is not compatible and should be rejected**. As stated, it is unfair and not right to impose an ill-conceived and unrealistic plan on the existing neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Roslin, CLS  
Broker Associate  
Front Range Commercial, LLC  
105 East Moreno Avenue, 2nd Floor  
Colorado Springs, CO 80903  
719-520-9500  
719-667-5323 direct  
719-520-1043 fax  
719-351-1328 cell  
[michael@frontrangecommercial.com](mailto:michael@frontrangecommercial.com)

On Tue, Apr 18, 2017 at 12:59 PM, Thelen, Lonna <[Lthelen@springsgov.com](mailto:Lthelen@springsgov.com)> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Attached is the 4<sup>th</sup> submittal for the Archer Park project. Please provide any new comments by April 27<sup>th</sup>. The applicant has requested that they be forwarded to the May 18<sup>th</sup> City Planning Commission meeting. If staff determines that the project is ready for City Planning Commission on May 18<sup>th</sup>, you will be notified of the meeting via email.

Thanks,

Lonna

## Thelen, Lonna

---

**From:** Michael Roslin <michael@frontrangecommercial.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 20, 2017 10:06 AM  
**To:** Thelen, Lonna  
**Cc:** Bette Ann Albert; Dianne Allen; Les Gruen; Diane Matsinger; David W. Donner; Corna Gossage; Paul Eckstein; Betty Wolfe; Whitney Galbraith; Scott Nilsen; james albert; daniel\_schnee@kindermorgan.com; Kelly Sung; Walt Harder; lorenemondo@comcast.net; Robert; Eric Ryan; Amy Moore; Ruth; Neill Erdossy; Norah Roscamp; pd22eckstein@comcast.net; Carrie Dunn Clarke; BILL KOSAR; Duncan Tenney; Fredrick Jones; D Archibald; Powl Smith  
**Subject:** Re: 4th submittal

Hi Lonna,

My wife and I remain opposed to the developers fourth submittal for Archer Park. Our objection to the proposed development is that it in no way is compatible with the existing neighborhood. The proposed density of homes are too much given the size and shape limitation of the land parcel. Once again, In my opinion , the developer has not adequately addressed the neighborhood concerns. It is unfair and unwise to approve the seven (7) homes into a site that can not support or has no plans to include curb, gutter or sidewalks. I have said the same numerous times, apparently to no avail. It is simply insane to approve a development with a 20 foot wide road, even with the developers proposed sliver of land to park excess vehicles. It is still a parking lot regardless of how the developers representative defines or characterizes this. This proposed project is simply a bad idea , the results of which may negatively impact the quality of the neighborhood and my residency. I would urge the developer to re consider his proposed number of homes and land on a lesser number which will allow for a wider road, curb gutter and sidewalks. If this were contemplated, then the proposed plans could reflect a 30-35 ft wide road , with curbs , gutters and sidewalks, leaving enough permeable areas for proper drainage, (NOT A DETENTION/RETENTION POND) , circulation of vehicles in and out of said development ,in addition to providing adequate on street parking (within Archer Park) and would be a better fit for the existing neighborhood, which I think is stated as one of several conditions for city approval. This project as proposed **is not compatible and should be rejected.** As stated it is unfair and not right to impose an ill conceived and unrealistic plan on the existing neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Michael A. Roslin , CLS  
Broker Associate  
Front Range Commercial, LLC  
105 East Moreno Avenue, 2nd Floor  
Colorado Springs, Co 80903  
719-520-9500  
719-667-5323 direct  
719-520-1043 fax  
719-351-1328 cell  
[michael@frontrangecommercial.com](mailto:michael@frontrangecommercial.com)

On Tue, Apr 18, 2017 at 12:59 PM, Thelen, Lonna <[Lthelen@springsgov.com](mailto:Lthelen@springsgov.com)> wrote:

**Figure 7 - 4th Submittal Neighborhood Comments**

Good afternoon,

Attached is the 4<sup>th</sup> submittal for the Archer Park project. Please provide any new comments by April 27<sup>th</sup>. The applicant has requested that they be forwarded to the May 18<sup>th</sup> City Planning Commission meeting. If staff determines that the project is ready for City Planning Commission on May 18<sup>th</sup>, you will be notified of the meeting via email.

Thanks,

Lonna



**Lonna Thelen, AICP**  
Principal Planner | South Team



Phone: [\(719\) 385-5383](tel:7193855383)

Email: [lthelen@springsgov.com](mailto:lthelen@springsgov.com)

**Land Use Review Division**

City of Colorado Springs

30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 105

Colorado Springs, CO 80901



LEADING THE WAY TO  
OUR FUTURE

*Links:*

[Planning & Community Development Home](#) | [Look At Applications Online](#) | [FAQ](#)  
[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#) | [Applications and Checklists](#)

 Before printing, please consider the environment

## Thelen, Lonna

---

**From:** Michael Roslin <michael@frontrangecommercial.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 22, 2017 11:04 AM  
**To:** Thelen, Lonna  
**Cc:** Bette Ann Albert; Dianne Allen; Les Gruen; Diane Matsinger; David W. Donner; Corna Gossage; Paul Eckstein; Betty Wolfe; Whitney Galbraith; Scott Nilsen; james albert; daniel\_schnee@kindermorgan.com; Kelly Sung; Walt Harder; lorenemondo@comcast.net; Robert; Eric Ryan; Amy Moore; Ruth; Neill Erdossy; Norah Roscamp; pd2zeckstein@comcast.net; Carrie Dunn Clarke; BILL KOSAR; Duncan Tenney; Fredrick Jones; D Archibald; Powl Smith  
**Subject:** Re: 4th submittal- Roslin 7 El Encanto Drive- Additional Comments

Hi Lonna,

I wanted to share with you additional thoughts regarding the developers fourth submittal. As I previously mentioned , a 20 ft. wide road with out curb, gutter and sidewalks ,or proper drainage, just does not make sense especially with one point of ingress/egress into the development, not to mention the ill conceived sliver of area to be carved out for on street parking ,which a reasonable person will conclude and consider it to be a parking lot. Just a dumb idea. This is certainly not compatible with the existing neighborhood.

My additional comment would be to request **a traffic study**. I know that they are complex, however, I feel that it is needed to address circulation of vehicles. I looked into the methodology of doing traffic studies. One aspect that I noticed was that single detached homes with a two (2) car garage, had about 10 trips per day in and out of each residence. This also does not take into consideration, commercial service vehicles of all types. Additionally, I believe the proposed seven (7) home sites will have three (3) car garages which will amplify the amount of traffic. You can do the math, the numbers are huge. The end result is that because the parcel and access to the property have significant challenges, the idea of allowing 7 homes to be built will cause problems in the existing neighborhood with traffic congestion and spill over of parking into the existing neighborhood. This is simply not equitable to the existing neighborhood and is not a safe plan. A proper traffic study is needed.

Michael A. Roslin , CLS  
Broker Associate  
Front Range Commercial, LLC  
105 East Moreno Avenue, 2nd Floor  
Colorado Springs, Co 80903  
719-520-9500  
719-667-5323 direct  
719-520-1043 fax  
719-351-1328 cell  
[michael@frontrangecommercial.com](mailto:michael@frontrangecommercial.com)

On Tue, Apr 18, 2017 at 12:59 PM, Thelen, Lonna <[Lthelen@springsgov.com](mailto:Lthelen@springsgov.com)> wrote:

Good afternoon,

Attached is the 4<sup>th</sup> submittal for the Archer Park project. Please provide any new comments by April 27<sup>th</sup>. The applicant has requested that they be forwarded to the May 18<sup>th</sup> City Planning Commission meeting. If staff

**Figure 7 - 4th Submittal Neighborhood Comments**



determines that the project is ready for City Planning Commission on May 18<sup>th</sup>, you will be notified of the meeting via email.

Thanks,

Lonna



**Lonna Thelen, AICP**  
Principal Planner | South Team



Phone: [\(719\) 385-5383](tel:(719)385-5383)

Email: [lthelen@springsgov.com](mailto:lthelen@springsgov.com)

**Land Use Review Division**

City of Colorado Springs

30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 105

Colorado Springs, CO 80901



LEADING THE WAY TO  
OUR FUTURE

*Links:*

[Planning & Community Development Home](#) | [Look At Applications Online](#) | [FAQ](#)  
[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#) | [Applications and Checklists](#)



Before printing, please consider the environment

## Thelen, Lonna

---

**From:** smithpowl@aol.com  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 23, 2017 12:06 AM  
**To:** Thelen, Lonna  
**Cc:** Bette Ann Albert; Dianne Allen; Les Gruen; Diane Matsinger; David W. Donner; Corna Gossage; Paul Eckstein; Betty Wolfe; Whitney Galbraith; Scott Nilsen; james albert; daniel\_schnee@kindermorgan.com; Kelly Sung; Walt Harder; lorenemondo@comcast.net; Robert; Eric Ryan; Amy Moore; Ruth; Neill Erdossy; Norah Roscamp; pd22eckstein@comcast.net; Carrie Dunn Clarke; BILL KOSAR; Duncan Tenney; Fredrick Jones; D Archibald; Michael Roslin <michael@frontrangecommercial.com>  
**Subject:** RE: 4th submittal- Roslin 7 El Encanto Drive- Additional Comments

Hello Lonna,

I concur strongly with concerns surfaced by other Mayfield and El Encanto residents (particularly the Roslins, Wolfes and Alberts) that three points in particular that have not yet been adequately addressed by the developer:

1. A traffic study is a fair and common sense request on the part of the current residents. It could confirm the assessment made by the developer, and allay the concerns of the Mayfield and El Encanto neighborhoods – or demonstrate that developer’s plan is inadequate and unworkable as feared by the residents. A further street and parking traffic study is required to ensure adequate and safe handling of the additional traffic brought in by the Archer Park cul-de-sac residents (if developed).
2. Storm water runoff onto Mayfield Lane (and attendant construction debris, especially during the multi-year construction of new homes, landscaping, streets and utilities, etc.), is unacceptable, period and will be the subject of lawsuits. Can the developer include additional storm water drainage methods and systems that contractually guarantee no overflow onto any part of Mayfield?
3. Utility access. We are concerned that the existing utility access point west of Mayfield Lane is inadequate to support 7 new homes, and understand the at the developer has recognized this and decided to develop a new access point. We have not seen, and we are very concerned about the plans to ensure adequate power, water and sewage for the seven home Archer Park development. If the development and emplacement of upgraded lines, pipe, etc. damages Mayfield Lane (private property), or disrupts access to our neighborhood, we should be advised, allowed to comment and legally object, or minimally be compensated by the developer.

We are not opposed to the development per se. Some residents would like to see the area remain a green space, but most of us understand that the owner has the right to sell his property to a developer that can develop it. We *are* opposed to having our neighborhood degraded by a developer who could care less about our concerns in his pursuit of maximized profit. We feel that the developer is simply ignoring our concerns, because he has no *legal* obligation to do otherwise. This concerns us all because the developer has a reputation – deserved or not – for renegeing on agreements in previous land development projects.

To my knowledge the developer has never sat down with the Mayfield and El Encanto residents to engage in a serious discussion or series of discussions to find mutually acceptable solutions to resident concerns. For example, the Mayfield HOA might be willing to lease or sell access to portions of Mayfield Lane for developer use in creating a more reasonable and acceptable storm water, traffic and utility access solution for Archer Park, as that would be mutually beneficial for all. The developer has never attempted to negotiate such access or usage. He appears to prefer marginal solutions (narrow access roads, retention ponds, etc.) that barely meet city planning requirements and have a high probability of failure later, when legal remedy will be impossible to obtain. Compromise is a wonderful thing; legal bullying creates unnecessary enmity and will cause residents of Mayfield and El Encanto to fight this development, and thereby drive up the developer’s costs, if not stopping his efforts

**Figure 7 - 4th Submittal Neighborhood Comments**

Legal remedies are hard and expensive, and our HOA or individual homeowners do not want to have to pursue them after the fact, so we must do our due diligence now to ensure that the developer doesn't renege on us later. This would all be so much easier and friendlier if the developer would engage us in a direct discussion, so that we can believe that the quality of life we enjoy, our property values, the safety of our friends and families and other factors are not degraded simply because a developer is trying to squeeze another \$10,000 of profit out of a multi-million dollar investment.

Until he does so, we will appeal to the city planning commission to ensure our concerns are fully addressed with more than non-solutions, or barely marginal solutions, to very large potential problems.

Thank you,  
Powl and Jody Smith  
220 Mayfield Lane

To: Lonna Thelen

April 26, 2017

From: Bill Kosar

I continue to have multiple concerns about the proposed Archer Park development for which the developer has not provided acceptable solutions and/or responses.

### **Storm water control and drainage**

I think this is the most significant problem associated with development of this site. The developer has not provided sufficient information on how storm water from the frequent heavy rains that occur in this neighborhood will be managed. The entire site is pitched towards the northeast and in addition it has a large swale on it that directs most of its runoff into the backyards of the homes on Mayfield. Betty Wolfe (whose backyard backs up to the site) stated in her February 26, 2017 email that:

Also, we have serious concerns about stormwater drainage and the parking plan on the north boundary of the pasture (i.e., directly behind the houses on the south side of our HOA). Mr. DeLesk did not adequately provide for stormwater drainage when he built our subdivision. We have water flowing from the pasture south to north into our backyards and through our properties in times of heavy rain. My side yard completely washes into the street and I have to hire someone to shovel the gravel and mulch back into the yard. That problem will be much worse once 85% of the soil is covered with non-permeable surfaces, which causes us to be concerned with not only water in our backyards and running through our properties, but water flooding our basements as well. Also, this permeable surface will become less permeable over time as mud flows over it.

The latest feedback in the developer's response letter states that the proposed detention/retention pond has been designed using standard procedures but we have not received any information that we have previously requested on the assumptions that were used to model rainfall rates or accumulations. I have previously stated that this neighborhood gets very heavy rainfall accumulations (one to three inches) within a 24 hour period two to seven times a year. The neighborhood is extremely opposed to the proposed retention pond due to the environmental, esthetic, and safety problems it will create.

The following are my comments from an earlier response:

*"In addition to being frequently ineffective from a storm water management perspective this pond will be a health hazard because it will not drain itself and dry out quickly via adsorption of water during the periods of heavy rainfall that occur during the summer months when mosquitoes breed. It will be an ugly eyesore 100% of the time in the middle of a neighborhood that has been developed for about 30 years. I think all of the residents who have sent responses to you oppose this aspect of the project and I cannot believe that when the requirement for detention ponds was defined that the city planners anticipated situations like the one that will exist here. If this land is going to be developed the city and Mr. Delesk must create a solution that:*

- *Prevents excessive storm water runoff into the city's storm sewers and ultimately Fountain Creek*
- *Does not create a health hazard from either a drowning or insect perspective*
- *Is esthetically acceptable to the neighborhood*
- *Will be maintained properly for an indefinite period of time. Maintenance cannot be subject to the whims of a home owners association that will not want to spend money to maintain it.*
- *Will not burden El Encanto with additional drainage overflow*
- *Has been proven to be effective in locations where there are frequent large amounts of precipitation in a short period of time*

*We do not want the city to be conducting experiments in small-scale detention pond design and construction in the middle of our neighborhood. If all of the aforementioned requirements cannot be achieved then the land should not be developed."*

#### **Street width, sidewalks, and parking**

The developer is continuing to promote a plan that does not include sidewalks or curbs by using the justification that this development should have a "rural" feel. This reasoning is preposterous and is just an effort by the developer to minimize development costs. The proposed development is clearly not rural when it will be an integrated part of an existing neighborhood which includes the tightly packed structures on Mayfield and very established houses along El Encanto. The entire neighborhood is very mature, many of the homes in it are at least 60 years old. We have sidewalks on all of El Encanto, Mayfield, and surrounding streets and this type of street treatment should be maintained. This will be a public street from all perspectives and should be treated in that manner. I will repeat my comments from an earlier response:

*"The developer is continuing to insist that a 20 foot wide street with no on-street parking is adequate because some auxiliary parking will be available along the side of the street. This parking will not be easily accessible to all proposed residences which means that prohibited on-street parking will regularly occur. It would be much better to adequately size the street during the initial development phase and avoid future parking and access problems. The proposed street width of 20 feet may meet the requirements for a private street but it is not adequate for a street in a neighborhood where there is a high volume of traffic to all residences from United Parcel Service, garbage trucks, and similar large vehicles. These vehicles always stop or park on the street in front of the home they are providing service to, they will not be pulling into people's driveways to maintain adequate emergency vehicle access. The plan to ban all on-street parking cannot be effectively enforced, the fire department chief told us that neither the fire department nor the police department can have illegally vehicles towed away, they can only ticket them. If a vehicle is ever left unattended on the street an access problem will be created that will last for*

*an indeterminate period of time; ie: days or weeks. There do not appear to be any 20 foot wide streets in this area and most of the streets are much wider than this.”*

In summary, the fourth submission of a development plan by Mr. Delesk is unacceptable, it does not address the neighborhood concerns which you have received extensive previous comments on. The developer is entitled to develop his land but the development must be planned to ensure that it will not have any negative environmental or esthetic impact on the existing neighborhood. As I stated previously, this development does not need to be built and the neighborhood should not be forced to accept gross adverse changes to its basic environment for the sake of it.

Please ensure that these comments are sent on to the City Planning Commission if this plan is submitted for their review.

Thank you,

Bill Kosar

**Figure 7 - 4th Submittal Neighborhood Comments**

**Thelen, Lonna**

---

**From:** james albert <jdalbert1@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 26, 2017 8:08 PM  
**To:** Thelen, Lonna  
**Subject:** response to 4th submission

Lonna,

At this time I have chosen not to compose another 4 page letter that contains extensive objections to the development that the developer continues to ignore . There are several issues that make an immediate referral to planning commission not appropriate. Utilities access and Drainage safety continue to be inadequately addressed .

I was extremely involved with the letter written by Les Gruen which summarizes the acute issues which appear to be unsolvable which is why the developer changes nothing from the 3rd to 4th submission except to inaccurately include all sorts of easements that are incorrectly characterized public vs private and has made his pond smaller that was already drastically undersized. This letter represents my position on this development.

#### UTILITES

1) Mr. Delesk WILL NOT be able to use the private easement to 12 El Encanto to place his utilities. He was provided an easement off of Mayfield that he has chosen to abandon. You personally witnessed the significant traffic that occurs daily to our rented home at 12 El Encanto and I WILL NOT allow that traffic to be interrupted , the ground be dug up , or the surface changed to an impermeable surface as we need some line of defense against his fatally flawed drainage plan. We see no plan for utility access. Also the Mayfield HOA WILL NOT allow access to their street in any other place that which was previously granted by the city. Mr. Delesk takes the advantages of using “private streets” for development but later refuses to respect the rights of the owners of that private property. He clearly feels he is above the law.

Remember it was because of Mr. Delesk’s disruptive behavior with the neighbors that he was precluded from participating in the easement discussion that occurred between the Alberts and the Enochs. That is why the language is not conducive to using that piece of land for his development's utilities. As I said before If there is no agreements between both owners of the 12 El Encanto and the development property the STATUS QUO status of the easement will remain. It is not our fault that Mr. Delesks plan was so controversial that he was forced to purchase the land before he had an approved plan. Most reasonable developers would never do that until they at a bare minimum had acceptable plans for utility access and drainage safety. Its called due diligence, and he failed to perform it properly.

2) DRAINAGE:



Mr. Delesk has used the inadequate and inaccurate (according to current standards) data for calculations in this project. They were inaccurate when he did his first development on Mayfield which is why its residents experience constant water flooding issues as well as El Encanto residents experience water and sludge overflow into their street from the easement. He continues to use the same data. That problem is about to get radically worse as he creates 85% impervious surfaces. I am legally not required to absorb any more than the "historic flow" onto our property. At this time we do not receive any water onto our property that is 4 feet below this development. Our calculations from an independent engineer (Obering Worth and Assoc.) that accurately includes off site flows demonstrate the pond is undersized by 2.5 times. All the water cannot get into the pond as it is in the wrong place. They have used the "End of the Pipe" model which is not recommended in the CS drainage manual. The pond should actually be in the south west part of the property but that would inhibit maximum density of homes. The pond will overflow both onto Mayfield and the shared easement and into our property. One drop of water draining west to east onto either one of our properties (9 or 12 El Encanto) will exceed the historic flows resulting in appropriate legal action. One drop of water from the pond draining onto the private property of Mayfield road will result in legal action.

I hope we can prevent this catastrophe in the making by denying further progress on this project until these issues are resolved or proved to be terminal. I had thought that this was your position after the last submission.

Please do not hesitate to contact me

Sincerely

James D. Albert, MD

## Thelen, Lonna

---

**From:** Diane Matsinger <diane@matsingerlaw.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 27, 2017 12:13 PM  
**To:** Thelen, Lonna  
**Cc:** 'Bette Ann Albert'; 'Dianne Allen'; 'Les Gruen'; 'David W. Donner'; 'Corna Gossage'; 'Michael Roslin'; 'Paul Eckstein'; 'Betty Wolfe'; 'Whitney Galbraith'; 'Scott Nilsen'; 'james albert'; daniel\_schnee@kindermorgan.com; 'Kelly Sung'; 'Walt Harder'; lorenemondo@comcast.net; 'Robert'; 'Eric Ryan'; 'Amy Moore'; 'Ruth'; 'Neill Erdossy'; 'Norah Roscamp'; 'Walt Harder'; pd22eckstein@comcast.net; 'Carrie Dunn Clarke'; 'Dianne Allen'; 'Duncan Tenney'; 'Fredrick Jones'; 'D Archibald'; 'Powl Smith'; 'BILL KOSAR'; 'Diane Matsinger'; michael@frontrangecommercial.com  
**Subject:** RE: 4th submittal fro Archer Park Project

Good morning, Lonna:

Please consider these comments on the Applicant's Fourth Submittal, as well as the comments raised by others in my neighborhood, as to this submittal and the previous submittals. Most particularly, I urge your Department **to not send** this matter to the Planning Commission until the problems with the submission have been resolved by the applicant.

**Stormwater:** I have reviewed the City's Drainage Manual ("Manual") and the applicant's Drainage Report (prepared 9/16 and updated 1/17). This significant issue cannot be resolved at this stage of the proceedings for the following reasons:

The applicant is proposing an "**end of the pipe**" system, which is supposed to send all of the runoff into one detention pond at the northeast corner. As you know, this is not the method preferred by the City (Manual, Vol. 1, sec. 2.6, re integration throughout the site, and Vol. 2, Step. 2, p. 1-12). In this case, the end of the pipe plan is inadequate for numerous reasons.

**Underestimated Flow.** The design places the entire burden of overflow on the neighbors, rather than on the residents of the subdivision. Previous comments submitted by the neighborhood and an independent expert have demonstrated that the applicant has significantly underestimated the flow. The applicant has also premised the Report on a **1987** study for his Northstar subdivision. There has been a considerable amount of development in the Broadmoor since 1987, which obviously affects the flow coming onto the site. In addition, the 1987 study was flawed because it did not handle the water coming onto the Northstar site subdivision, much less the flow coming off of the subdivision itself. There can be no adequate Drainage Report or Plan for this site until and unless current conditions have been verified and accommodated.

**Water Does Not Make 90 Degree Turns.** The maps submitted with the Drainage Report demonstrate that the applicant is proposing to have the flow make two 90-degree turns. The first is the proposed south to north flow, which the applicant proposes to turn directly east before it hits the backyards of the Northstar residences. The second is the west to east, which the applicant proposes turn directly to the north into the detention pond. That proposal ignores the properties of water, as evidenced by the fact that the water flowing from the west to the east, generated by the Northstar subdivision, does not turn left and go north when it reaches the intersection of Mayfield and El Encanto – as previously planned. Instead, in times of heavy rain, heavy flow overflows the culvert which leads to the stormwater drain on the northwest corner of Sierra Vista and El Encanto. That overflow flows east on El Encanto, past my house and into Bill Kosar's front yard. The end of  
**Figure 7 - 4th Submittal Neighborhood Comments**

the pipe drainage system proposed by this applicant is planned to overflow at the same point (i.e., the culvert that runs north/south across Mayfield where it intersects with El Encanto). Because of the existing conditions, that is a recipe for disaster. Runoff not captured by the applicant's inadequate plan will run east into the Albert's house, and overflow from the pond will add to the overflow coming east down El Encanto from Northstar. Proper drainage for this project must first accommodate the water coming into the site at the southwest corner of the pasture, and then accommodate it again before it reaches the corner of Mayfield and El Encanto.

**The Maintenance Agreement Cannot Be Deferred to the Time of Permitting.** The Manual, Vol. 2, sections 2.0 and 3.0 require maintenance plans and agreements to be submitted as part of the development review/approval process and be recorded with the property. The applicant has not submitted the Maintenance Agreement, but instead states that it will be submitted "at the time of permitting." The Manual does not allow that procedure, nor should the City, particularly in a case like this. This applicant is not planning on developing all of the residences in the subdivision at the same time. Instead, build out may take many years, as people come along to purchase the lots. However, the detention pond must be constructed during the initial infrastructure phases of development to capture the runoff. During that phase, and until the development is built-out and the HOA formed, who will be responsible for maintenance?

**Responsibility for Maintenance is Still Vague.** The applicant has stated that the required changes have been made to the plans so that an HOA be responsible for maintenance of the pond. That is problematic for the reasons stated in the previous paragraph. It is also not correct. Page 4 of the Preliminary Plat still states that The Newport Company will own and maintain the pond. Once the maintenance responsibilities are clearly defined, this development requires a commitment of funds, in the form of a bond, to ensure proper repairs and maintenance (Manual, Vol. 2, sec. 1.11, and Chap. 6).

**If a Detention Pond Is Permitted for this Subdivision, It Must be Fenced.** Previous comments have documented the number of children in this neighborhood, and have also stressed the number of drowning deaths each year in unfenced ponds. Yet, the applicant refuses to add a fence around the pond, claiming that "no fence is required." The Manual requires public officials to "protect public health, safety, and welfare" (see Manual, Vol. 2, Secs. 1.10 and Step. 1, p. 1-12). Ponds in residential neighborhoods are an attractive nuisance to children, and the City should exercise its discretion to add conditions for development that require them to be fenced.

**If a Detention Pond is Permitted for this Subdivision, the Maintenance Agreement Must Specifically Provide for Mosquito Control.** The Manual also requires that facilities "shall be designed to reduce the likelihood and extent of shallow standing water that can result in mosquito breeding, which can be a nuisance and a public health concern (e.g., West Nile virus). The potential for nuisances, odors and prolonged soggy conditions shall be evaluated for BMPs, especially in areas with high pedestrian traffic or visibility" (Manual, Vol. 2, sec. 1.10). The applicant has chosen to place his detention pond farthest away from the homes he is proposing to build, and nearest to the neighbors. The Maintenance Agreement required to be submitted before project approval must be available for public review to ensure that these essential provisions are included.

**Utilities:** I refer you to the now well-documented fact and law (submitted by Attorney B. Wright) that establishes the applicant has no right to construct the requisite utilities in the easements to which the maps refer. When the applicant purchased the pasture lot, he was on notice that it was a fragment, not plotted with any previous subdivision, and for which no utility easements had been provided. He cannot establish a right to use easements for utilities simply by adding book and page numbers of documents on the map, when the express language of the documents he cites does not allow for that use.

**Traffic/Road Width/Sidewalks and Curbs/Parking Strip Along the Backyards of the Mayfield**

**Residences/Neighborhood Character:** Please continue to consider the comments by me and my neighbors with respect to these important issues.

Thank you in advance for considering these important issues.

Diane Matsinger  
14 El Encanto Dr  
Colorado Springs, CO 80906

---

**From:** Thelen, Lonna <[Lthelen@springsgov.com](mailto:Lthelen@springsgov.com)>

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 18, 2017 12:59 PM

**To:** Bette Ann Albert; Dianne Allen; Les Gruen; Diane Matsinger; David W. Donner; Corna Gossage; Michael Roslin; Paul Eckstein; Betty Wolfe; Whitney Galbraith; Scott Nilsen; james albert; [daniel\\_schnee@kindermorgan.com](mailto:daniel_schnee@kindermorgan.com); Kelly Sung; Walt Harder; [lorenemondo@comcast.net](mailto:lorenemondo@comcast.net); Robert; Eric Ryan; Amy Moore; Ruth; Neill Erdossy; Norah Roscamp; Walt Harder; [pd22eckstein@comcast.net](mailto:pd22eckstein@comcast.net); Carrie Dunn Clarke; Dianne Allen; BILL KOSAR; Duncan Tenney; Fredrick Jones; D Archibald; Powl Smith; BILL KOSAR; BILL KOSAR

**Subject:** 4th submittal

Good afternoon,

Attached is the 4<sup>th</sup> submittal for the Archer Park project. Please provide any new comments by April 27<sup>th</sup>. The applicant has requested that they be forwarded to the May 18<sup>th</sup> City Planning Commission meeting. If staff determines that the project is ready for City Planning Commission on May 18<sup>th</sup>, you will be notified of the meeting via email.

Thanks,

Lonna



**Lonna Thelen, AICP**  
Principal Planner | South Team

Phone: (719) 385-5383

Email: [lthelen@springsgov.com](mailto:lthelen@springsgov.com)



**Land Use Review Division**

City of Colorado Springs

30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 105

Colorado Springs, CO 80901



LEADING THE WAY TO  
OUR FUTURE

Links:

[Planning & Community Development Home](#) | [Look At Applications Online](#) | [FAQ](#)  
[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#) | [Applications and Checklists](#)

**Figure 7 - 4th Submittal Neighborhood Comments**

