

Schultz, Michael

From: Pan Demos <pandemos28@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 04, 2019 9:59 AM
To: Schultz, Michael

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!

Dear Mr. Schultz'

We are writing with concerns regarding the new housing development, University Bluffs Filing No.4A. Our major concerns are related to the detention pond located behind our house at 4912 Mt. Union Court. Specifically, who will be responsible for maintenance, including algae and mosquitoes? What will prevent seepage below the pond toward our property? Thank you for addressing these concerns.

Sincerely,

George and Pan Demos
pandemos28@gmail.com
719-266-6031

Schultz, Michael

From: Doug Drewnicky <d.drewnicky45@comcast.net>
Sent: Sunday, February 03, 2019 10:43 AM
To: Schultz, Michael
Cc: d.drewnicky45@comcast.net
Subject: Response to Development Proposal University Bluffs Filing No: 4a

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!

Zone Change Criteria (Section 7.5.603)

This action will be detrimental to the public interest, Health, Safety, Convenience and most certainly general welfare. The proposed development will remove 9.9 acres of open space, home to wildlife, trails and scenic beauty. The neighborhood residents that use this open space derive great pleasure from the natural state this land allows. We recognize if a school had been built the structure would have had and still have less negative and varied impact.

In addition, were the development proposal to be approved lengthy construction efforts would be detrimental to the citizens who live in the area for blocks surrounding the proposed building site. The construction traffic, heavy duty track hoes, rock buckets, rock teeth, soil preparation and compaction would certainly have an impact on the welfare, health and safety of the University Park Residents and properties. What kind of "fracking" and geological impact will all the earth removal and alteration have on surrounding foundations and sediment?

Collegiate Drive is one of a few limited entrances to the University Park community. Construction site parking and right of way congestion would be most inconvenient and pose hazards to the residents and workers of the project. Further compounding the previously stated concerns it is note from the proposal "production will likely be slow".

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

Irene and Douglas Drewnicky

4704 Julliard Drive

Schultz, Michael

From: Patty Moos <pattyslah@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 10:39 AM
To: Schultz, Michael
Subject: University Bluffs Filing No. 4A

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!

ATTN: Mike Schultz

Sent from my iPhone

I am writing this to let you know some of our concerns with the above filing:

1). When we built in University Park 17 years ago we were told not to cut any bushes or trees on our property- what will happen to all the beautiful trees on the property when you start to build??

2). Why are you planning only one exit/entrance into the property?

We are concerned there is already a high volume of traffic now on Collegiate now, both from the residents of University Park as well as from the residents in the apartments at the top of Rockhurst.

3). My other concern is you say you are going to have visitors park on Collegiate while visiting owners in the subdivision. That bothers us because of the way cars fly down Collegiate now. We see this as an accident waiting to happen!! I would suggest if you do this to only have parking on the right side of Collegiate as you go up the hill. Thank you for considering my concerns. We will be attending the meeting on February 4 and hope to have our concerns addressed at that meeting.

Sincerely,
David & Patty Mjos
2271 Mankato Ct

Laura Mastrolia
4936 Mount Union Court
Colorado Springs, CO 80918

Jan. 30, 2019

Mr. Mike Schultz
Principal Planner, City of Colorado Springs
mdschultz@springsgov.com
(719) 385-5089

Dear Mr. Schultz,

I am writing about University Bluffs Filing No. 4A. I have reviewed the zoning change, urban development and final plat documents on line (CPC PUZ 19-00004, CPC PUD 19-00005, AR FP 19-00009).

We have lived at Lot #64 in University Park since 2005 which borders the new development.

I have the following concerns about the new development:

1. The new road that intersects with Collegiate **presents potential traffic hazards** as it is on a hill where cars don't typically slow down and there is a blind spot. Is there a proposed plan for putting in a stop sign or speed bump?
2. I am hoping that **drainage problems** will be avoided if planned well.
3. Will **fences** be allowed in new development? **How many feet** will be between our property and the new home to be built behind ours?
4. The **number of homes, 29 lots, seems excessive** to be built upon 9.9 acres and there appears to be a **lack of wide enough road** in the new development.
5. It would be in the best interest of the community of University Park residents if University Bluffs is a **part of the same University Park HOA** that currently exists.

Thank you for considering these questions and concerns.

Laura Mastrolia
719-306-2833
Lauramastrolia1@gmail.com

Schultz, Michael

From: Jerry Saskowsky <saskjp@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 30, 2019 7:36 AM
To: Schultz, Michael
Subject: Univ Bluffs Filing No 4A

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!

Dear Mr. Schultz,

My wife and I have been residents(home owners) at 4596 Seton Hall Dr. which is off of Collegiate Dr. for 3 over years.

Having moved here from Washington state, we wanted to reside in a location that typified the beauty and environment and vistas that we had seen on our prior travels to The Springs. Having looked at numerous houses in a variety of neighborhoods , we immediately new the house we have purchased on Seton Hall Rd was the home for us! Just driving around the neighborhood convinced us that we were truly in Colorado ! Not only does it have tremendous views but the open space in the area was magnificent ! Especially off the back deck of our home.

But what also convinced us to purchase here was the beautiful park, hidden canyon , and natural open space off Collegiate Dr. It is such a natural and rugged looking space that it immediately draws our eyes to it every time we pass by. It's a large part of the attractiveness that made us want to call this place our home. Besides the beauty of the land with it's pine trees and rugged terrain , we have witnessed on many occasions , deer wandering thru that open area. As I imagine, it is as much home to them in their natural habitat as it is for us humans to enjoy its natural beauty.

There is a large deer population up here and a few more homes there would not only be an offense to us humans who have come to love the area but also the many animals that call the area home.

If other people want to live in this beautiful community there are homes for sale that can be purchased. As a matter of fact there are several homes on our street for sale and others in the neighborhood .

In closing, I respectfully request that you take my comments in consideration ,as I'm sure many other home owners have responded to your Filing No. 4A

Respectfully,

Gerald and Paulene Saskowsky

Sent from [Outlook](#)

Schultz, Michael

From: Lindsey Duncan <lduncan18@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 31, 2019 10:42 AM
To: Schultz, Michael
Subject: Concerning Development Proposal University Bluffs Filing No. 4A

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!

January 31, 2019

Dear Sir,

As a resident of University Park for over ten years, the proposal for the new housing development on the property adjacent to Collegiate Drive (File Numbers CPC PUZ 19-0004 and CPC PUD 19-00005) concerns me. I live on Mount Union Court, the street that will be most directly affected by this new residential area. My greatest concerns are summed up in the following three categories. Your attention and consideration are appreciated.

I. Safety

The development blueprint includes only one access and egress. The proposed street starts at the top of a blind hill on Collegiate Drive. The influx of cars that cannot be seen coming down Collegiate from above the blind hill will cause an undue hazard to those on Mount Union Court turning left on Collegiate Drive. Furthermore, while Collegiate Drive can be described as a main thoroughfare in University Park, it was not built and is not designed for increased traffic of this magnitude. It is my proposal that another entry/exit point be put in the development on its north side. I also suggest that for the safety of those driving on Collegiate Drive, the entry/exit on the south side of the development be moved west so that it does not begin at the top of the blind hill.

II. Economical

The draw of University Park has always been as an oasis in the middle of the city. While near major thoroughfares, it still remains a quiet, safe community. The size of the house, the size of the land plot, and the overall atmosphere of University Park have increased the value of homes. Basic economics indicates that when there is an addition of something, in this case, homes, the price in that market drops. There are currently 68 new home construction developments in Colorado Springs. While demand is currently high in Colorado Springs, the surplus of homes is going to bring the home value down. Moreover, the demand is for homes in a lower price range. The average price of a home in the 80918 zip code is \$254,500. The homes in University Park are on average at least \$150,000 more. The proposed development is closely aligned with the average 80918 neighborhood and not to University Park. This drastic price difference causes an undue economic burden on those who bought their home assuming their property value would maintain course over the length of the loan. When selling a home or refinancing it, the influx of homes into this neighborhood will adversely impact the equity available because the home value decreased as a result of this development. This is a loss in income that is outside the economic housing trend nationwide. Home value is always at the mercy of the economy; however, it should not be subject to changes made by a small group of people. I suggest that the number of homes and their overall value matches the surrounding neighborhood to decrease the economic stress on the current residents. That entails fewer homes on larger land plots and price points equal to current University Park prices. It is also my argument that the development of this land should be considered by the community at large and not by a board. The cost for those who live here is too steep.

III. Environmental

I have resigned myself to the finality of this development; however, I would be remiss not to articulate my objection to the development, mainly the negative impact on the environment. There are short-term and long-term consequences caused by this development. The proposed area of land remained open space through the entirety of Colorado Springs growth and urbanization. What this open space provides is the thriving of wildlife and foliage. Deer, coyote, rabbit, field mouse, and even bears and mountain lions rely on this space as a refuge. The city continues to build into animals' area and it is causing unnecessary issues for the city. The city's west side has recently been in the news because of the surplus deer population. The problem was described as "posing a threat to property and public safety." This causes the city and the community large amounts of money. By taking away the open space adjacent to Collegiate Drive the city is causing deer (et al) to invade personal property. They have nowhere else to go. My question is: why cause a problem intentionally? Would it not be best served for everyone if we worked to prevent monetary and environmental catastrophe? The belief of money over environment causes problems worldwide. While that comparison to this tract of land may seem hyperbolic, it is my contention that the choice to make money or to prevent issues is an easy and obvious one to make.

Regards,

Lindsey Duncan

Lduncan18@yahoo.com

719.271.9799

<https://www.perryandco.com/new-construction/colorado+springs-colorado/>

https://www.zillow.com/colorado-springs-co/in-university-park_att/

Seth Boster, "Colorado Springs deer could become the target of urban hunters," *The Gazette*, July 19, 2017, https://gazette.com/news/colorado-springs-deer-could-become-targets-of-urban-hunters/article_cf1284b0-b79b-568d-9f21-d152b04e32fb.html.

Schultz, Michael

From: Harris, Doug & Janice <dnj71@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, January 29, 2019 9:57 AM
To: Schultz, Michael
Cc: Judy Walton; Derek Patterson
Subject: University Bluffs Filing #4A Concerns

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!

Dear Mr Schultz,

I live near the University Bluffs Filing #4A, Northwest of Collegiate Drive and Mount Union Court and therefore have an active interest in what is developed on this property.

In September of 2018, a Colorado Springs developer RMC Corp, purchased the 9.9 acres parcel of land from Colorado Springs School District 11 (SD11) with the intent, as indicated in the Request For Offer (RFO), to build approximately 29 SINGLE FAMILY homes.

ALL entities who submitted an RFO to SD11 for consideration were required to accept the conditions and provisions of the SD11 property sales process. Part of that that process was that each RFO submission had a description of the intended use of the 9.9 acres of land if the bid was awarded to them. SD11 indicated more than once that this was an important consideration for their sale decision as they wanted to do what is “best for the community.” Therefore, when the bid was awarded and announced in our local newspaper (Gazette, September 11, 2018) the article did indeed indicate the developers intention was to build 29 single family dwellings.

Recently, neighboring homes received a “Notification of a Potential Development Project Near Your Property” notice (postmarked January 14, 2019). That notice called for comments by email or mail by January 30, 2019. There was no neighborhood meeting designated. The project description was as follows:

- * *This project proposes a single-family home development*
- * *Change of Zone to Planned Unit Development (PUD)*
- * *29 single-family lots*
- * *9.9 acres.*

File Numbers:

CPC PUZ 19-00004
CPC PUD 19-00005
AR FP 19-00009

I see now that there is a New/Revised “Notification of a Potential Development Project Near Your Property” notice (postmarked January 22, 2019). A neighborhood meeting is scheduled for February 4, 2019 and there are two noticeable changes in the "Development Proposal"1) the clause "This project proposes a single-family home development" has been removed and 2) file number AR FP 19-00009 has been deleted. The first change is of concern to me.

Was the clause that was removed simply redundancy since “29 single-family lots” is still listed under the project description? Or do these changes mean that RMC Corp wants to change the development plan they

submitted and possibly the intent is to no longer build "Single Family Dwellings"? If so, how can that be allowed? The single family dwellings were the basis of their bid proposal to SD11? Now that they own the property, can they simply submit NEW plans to the Colorado Springs Planning and Development Department to change the project description and build something other than was listed as the initial intention for this land purchase?

Therefore, I would like the following issues regarding University Bluffs Filing #4A to be addressed at the February 4, 2019 neighborhood meeting:

- 1) What change occurred between the first notice and the second notice that now requires a neighborhood meeting?
- 2) Why was the "single family dwelling" clause removed since that was the original intent of RMC Corp and the purchase from SD11.
- 3) What change occurred that file number AR FP 19-00009 was removed and what is AR FP - 19-00009?
- 4) Regardless of what is developed on this property, the construction must be of "like kind and quality" as the structures we currently have throughout the University Park community.
- 5) Fire safety concerns for a neighborhood of 29 homes with only "one way in and one way out" ...and "pipe stem" lots.
- 6) What landscaping plans have been submitted for this area? Especially along the Collegiate Dr expanse. As a community we want to be sure that the "curb appeal" continues to mesh with our existing community landscaping designs.
- 7) What is a "water quality retention pond?" This pond designation area is in the vicinity of an ongoing water seepage problem thru the asphalt on Collegiate Dr...will this pond exacerbate or cure the problem? Who maintains this pond?
- 8) In an earlier email from our University Park HOA (UP HOA) we were advised that the UP HOA Board is working with RMC to incorporate the new development into the UP HOA. Since University Bluffs Filing #4A is within the "foot print" of the University Park community, its residents must be dues paying members of the UP HOA. UP HOA does have other "sub associations" within our community, but they are all still a part of the overarching University Park HOA.

I appreciate any information you can provide me regarding my concerns.

Janice Harris
University Park Homeowner

Peter Puhek
4928 Mount Union Ct
Colorado Springs, CO 80918

January 24, 2019

Mr. Mike Schultz
Principal Planner, City of Colorado Springs
mdschultz@springsgov.com
(719) 385-5089

Dear Mr. Schultz,

I am writing about University Bluffs Filing No. 4A. I have reviewed the zoning change, urban development and final plat documents on line (CPC PUZ 19-00004, CPC PUD 19-00005, AR FP 19-00009). Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the plan. It looks like there has been a lot of great work and deep thought that went into this project. We look forward to working with you and the developer to keep everything going smoothly.

- Here are a few of our comments:

- 1) We were thrilled to read that the new houses will be of similar quality, size, and price range of our current neighborhood and that they will be following the guidelines of our current homeowners association.
- 2) One of the guidelines of the neighborhood is to make sure that all corner lots are "Ranch" style. Taller homes on these lots would be out of place and literally an "eye sore". Please maintain this guideline.
- 3) We have lot #63 that will butt up to the new development. We have some beautiful scrub oak on our boundary with the future home that will be next to our house. If at all possible, please put some rules in place to keep this scrub oak. If the new house is going to be set back 30 feet from the lot line, the scrub oak would be very beautiful, but also serve as a privacy barrier so we won't be staring into each other's back windows.
- 4) We are bird lovers. We have one of the best bird viewing lots in the entire city because of the open space that is soon to be developed. The scrub oak mentioned in #3 above has been a haven for the birds since we moved here 17 years ago. Along with the scrub oak, the plans for a pond near our lot is very thrilling. The birds will love it. We look forward to seeing duck, geese, and red-winged blackbirds. Our neighbors do have a few concerns for practical safety and maintenance, but we are more than thrilled to have a permanent pond there.
- 5) We need to work very closely with the developer to make sure that the drainage grading works for my lot, and the lower lots of #60, #61, and #62. We have awful drainage problems today. With some careful and coordinated planning with the developer and the lot owners, we should be able to fix the drainage problems and make something far better than today's grading.
- 6) Will fences be allowed in the new development?

- Concerns:

- 1) Packing 29 homes into the 9.9 acres doesn't seem consistent with the larger University Park (UP) development. The lots will all be roughly the size of my lot, but most homes in UP have nice back yards that don't have homes so close that it impacts privacy. The proposed lots in the new development are all relatively small and the plan looks very congested. We are already calling it

the “packed-in-like-sardines” development. Our home was the first one completed in this part of UP (17 years ago). We chose this lot because the proposed school, if it had been built, would have still given us plenty of space and privacy. We humbly ask that you consider a little more buffer space between the existing homes, like ours, and the new homes that will be staring into our back yards. We are very concerned about this crowding issue. This will be no better than the postage stamp lots in Briargate. They have fences for privacy, but we don’t. We paid an extra \$75,000 so that we didn’t have to live in a bee hive. Now we are losing this amenity that we thought would be part of living in UP. We will have no privacy and no fences. This is unacceptable for this neighborhood. I realize that 29 homes will bring a good profit and tax revenue, but you are really hurting us. I feel that my family is being violated and stomped on by these plans. Please give us more of a buffer. I would be happy if I could buy the 2,000 square feet next to my property (for a fair price) so that I can keep the scrub oak as part of my land. That would be good enough for me (and the birds).

- 2) You might want to seriously think about the parking problems. People like to have social get-togethers with lots of other people. Where are they going to park? I recommend putting in at least one overflow parking area in the development with spaces for at least 5 cars. Another possibility is to expand Collegiate to have another lane dedicated to parking – that would handle just about any overflow concerns. Another option is to allow and encourage residents to pave extra parking places on their land instead of xeriscaping. Please pave turning lanes before and after the entrance.
- 3) I think you are seriously underestimating the impact of moving trucks and large construction vehicles. You need to give space within this development for full size moving trucks and other large construction vehicles. Maybe an overflow parking area can also be designed for this purpose. Parking moving trucks on Collegiate is a very bad idea. Collegiate is a very busy road already. Widening Collegiate may be an answer, but it would be better for the future residents to have the trucks parked next to the home(s) of direct impact instead of being a dangerous nuisance to all of us every time someone moves in and out or needs heavy equipment.
- 4) Seriously consider putting lightning rods on your taller homes. We’ve seen a few lightning bolts hit in that area. Some homes in UP have been hit and burned by lightning.
- 5) There is a blind area on Collegiate between Mount Union Court and the proposed entrance into the new development. This can be mitigated by shaving Collegiate down a little to remove the current hump. Signs would also be helpful to warn the speeders on Collegiate to slow down and beware of cars entering the roadway. Once again, turning lanes would be very useful for safety.

Thank you for this opportunity to give you feedback. If you have any questions on what I wrote, please e-mail me at puhek77@netzero.net

Sincerely,

Peter Puhek
4928 Mount Union Court
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
(719) 278-7443

Schultz, Michael

From: Norm_Deanne Weinberg <stormin-dee@msn.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 27, 2019 11:17 AM
To: Schultz, Michael
Cc: Norm_Deanne Weinberg
Subject: University Bluffs Filing No. 4A - Property Owner concern

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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!

Mr. Schultz,

Thank you for providing the community near this proposed development an opportunity to comment. My husband and I ARE NOT in favor of this proposal.

We recently relocated to Colorado Springs (2018), coming from Northern VA, where life has gone from quiet to what has now become a vast urban area, overly dense housing, over crowded schools, roads, and services.

We selected our home in University Park do to the aesthetic nature, maturity of the neighborhood, the open controlled nature of the community and location. There are so many homes already available in COS as well as rentals, that adding such a high density development in an already established, mature area is of major concern. University Park was developed to bring part of the natural landscape to the people. The current University Park HOA pays for maintenance of several of the local parks. There is already nonresident usage of the current parks, children utilize the parks for bike riding, sledding, etc. With the addition of the proposed very dense housing, the existing Park, and current neighborhood openness will be impacted. Current layout within the neighborhood is no where near the proposed density, property values of the current houses will be impacted, roads, drainage, and even the transient nature of the proposed density will degrade University Park as a mature, established, controlled environment. Plus, the park will not sustain the use of so many additional families and pets.

The wildlife of this area is also at risk, and is part of the charm of living in University Park. It is very important for the quality of life in COS to maintain a feel of co-existence with nature. When we purchased our home, we were told the land being proposed for development was part of the existing park maintained by University Park HOA. While we have now found that to not be correct, the University Park HOA has a Resident supported plan to purchase the land and maintain the property as they do for University Park residents today. More open space and ability for people to enjoy the beauty that the enclave of University Park provides is very much needed within the city limits. These outlets of nature help people living near each other to respect space, both natural and personal residential property.

It deeply concerns us that within the center of University Park that a proposal to maintain the land as a park maintained by the HOA is not being considered as an alternative to more dense housing which brings crime, drugs, and will also put additional burden on the University Park home owners to have their park not able to support the addition of 29 new units.

What we have noticed about COS, is that there is a lot of the area that is empty, run down and could be revitalized vs. adding more density to an already mature established community.

Please reject this proposal in favor of maintaining and improving the quality of life the entire COS area can provide. Coming from densely populated Metro areas (Seattle, WA area and Northern VA), we have watched unnecessary development at the expense of the current residents quality of life, please reject this proposal.

Please feel free to contact us directly.

Respectfully,

Deanne and Norman Weinberg
2194 Wake Forest CT
Colorado Springs, CO 80918
719-999-5139
Stormin-dee@msn.com

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

Schultz, Michael

From: caroledon@comcast.net
Sent: Sunday, January 27, 2019 11:03 AM
To: Schultz, Michael
Cc: & Janice Doug
Subject: University Bluffs Filing #4

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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!

Mike,
Left you a voice mail last week hoping to re connect as it has been quit a while.

Regarding the above referenced development , I believe it is a good plan and layout considering the terrain and access. I have one concern regarding the detention pond at the southeast corn of the development . The location is perfect for the development and the drainage, but is the most visible to the community. I could not find, in the documents, any reference as to the landscaping plan and maintenance for this tract B. I would suggest a complete landscaping plan that would be attractive to the community yet maintain its functionality. avoiding the existing natural look that could create a mud hole at is base and bare slopes. A maintenance plan that would not only maintain the pond as an attractive parcel but spell out financial responsibility for the pond other than turning it over to the city. If feasible access by pedestrians or if not adequate fencing. Hopefully these concerns have been addressed. Thanks Mike and hope to connect soon.
Sincerely, Don Magill

Schultz, Michael

From: Barbie Archer <catfarms1@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 16, 2019 1:08 PM
To: Schultz, Michael
Subject: University Bluffs

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!

I am writing to you in regards to the proposed project for University Bluffs Filing No. 4A

I really do not want more housing to be put in. People in this neighborhood enjoy having that open space for going on walks and walking their pets. It's nice to have a natural area so close.

Houses were never suppose to be built in this area of universe park in the first place but it still happened. Please let us keep this one little space as is. Don't disrupt the wildlife any further.

Thank you,

Barbara Archer

Brown Valley Lane

**William H. & Karen A. Wiedemann
2233 Collegiate Drive
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80918
(719) 596-8227**

VIA E-MAIL: planningdev@springsgov.com; mdschultz@springsgov.com

January 26, 2019

Peter Wysocki
Director of Planning & Development

Mike Schultz
City Planner

Land Use Review Division
City of Colorado Springs
30 South Nevada, Suite 603
P.O. Box 1575 MC 155
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80901-1575

Re: The Commons
University Park Filing No. 4A
File nos. CPC PUZ 19-00004
CPC PUZ 19-00005
AR FP 19-00009

Gentlemen:

We have resided at 2233 Collegiate Drive since 2002. At the time we built our house, Collegiate Drive did not connect with Union Boulevard. The neighborhood had also not been fully developed. We enjoyed a short time of light traffic on Collegiate Drive.

Thereafter, University Park ("UP") became fully developed, and Collegiate Drive was opened to Union Boulevard. Collegiate Drive, originally intended to be a quiet residential street, has now turned into an arterial. It is the primary ingress to and egress from the entire UP neighborhood. In addition to the residents of University Park, those residing in the Erindale neighborhood and the area south of Vickers Drive and west of Academy Boulevard now also use Collegiate Drive as major means of ingress and egress.

In light of the congestion in the City, we sympathize with those who now use Collegiate Drive. It is the most direct route of accessing these neighborhoods from the south, as there are only two other access points, at Montebello Drive and Vickers Drive, each off of Academy Boulevard and much more indirect.

Our complaint is with the speed of the traffic on our street. The speed limit is 25 mph. This is largely ignored. We have cars speeding past the front of our house at 40 or 50 miles per hour. This is dangerous and inappropriate for a residential neighborhood.

FIGURE 5

We have experienced two instances of eastbound automobiles running off the road in front of our home. West and uphill from our driveway, there is a blind spot on Collegiate which prevents us from seeing eastbound traffic until it is relatively close. I am surprised there has not been a serious accident on our street.

We have not sat idly by. Bill met with Kathleen Kraeger, the City traffic engineer, who promised that a traffic study would be done. It never was. Bill wrote a letter to Pete Carey, the police chief, and later talked with him on the telephone. Chief Carey arranged to have a mobile radar monitor placed on the street, which in our opinion did no good. This monitor was also intended to accumulate data of the prevalence of speeding, but it failed to work properly and no data was assembled.

We have also begged the police department to enforce the speed limit on our street, to no avail. And quite frankly, enforcement only works for a short period of time. We really have no idea what else we can do.

The primary ingress and egress to this new development will also be Collegiate Drive. This means hundreds of additional trips a day up and down our street. It will make the traffic situation worse. We are so discouraged that we are considering selling our home. We would not anticipate receiving full value, as buyers are not interested in purchasing a home on a busy street.

Because there is nothing that can be done to change the layout of the streets, it appears that all that can be done is to install aggressive traffic-calming devices on Collegiate Drive. This has been done in other neighborhoods nearby. For example, traffic islands and street dips have been installed on Westwood Boulevard, Ridgeglen Road, and Ranch Circle southeast of our home. New stop signs have been placed on Mountview Lane, southwest of our home. Stanton Road, west of our home, has been closed to through traffic.

We know our concerns are shared by everyone who lives on our street. We are resigned to this development taking place. We most strongly urge that as a condition of approval, the traffic issues be fully and properly addressed and a solution engineered that will actually work.

Very truly yours,

William H. Wiedemann
Karen A. Wiedemann

cc: University Park Homeowners' Association
Via e-mail: Office@ZandRMgmt.com

Elizabeth A. Enas
4920 Mount Union Ct
Colorado Springs, CO 80918

January 23, 2019

Mr. Mike Schultz
Principal Planner, City of Colorado Springs
mdschultz@springsgov.com
(719) 385-5089

Dear Mr. Schultz,

I am writing about University Bluffs Filing No. 4A. I have reviewed the zoning change, urban development and final plat documents on line (CPC PUZ 19-00004, CPC PUD 19-00005, AR FP 19-00009). I have also discussed these documents with my immediate neighbors.

First, I am delighted that the new development will consist of high-quality homes. It is in keeping with the already established homes in the area.

Second, I bought my home in University Park because it is a beautiful and quiet neighborhood. I believe this is a result of the University Park Design Guidelines and Covenants, Conditions, Restrictions and Easements (CC&Rs). It is my sincere hope that the new development will be aligned with the existing University Park Design Guidelines and CC&Rs as closely as possible.

Third, I have some concerns about property drainage. The Preliminary/Final Drainage Report states that there will be a detention pond at Basin D-1 (page 7 of the report). Appendix C describes the Detention Basin Outlet Structure Design (approximately 5 pages into Appendix C – there isn't a page number). From what I read, it seems that there will be a permanent pool of water in the detention pond. The Excess Urban Runoff Volume (EURV) will release within 72 hours while the Water Quality Capture Volume (WQCV) will release in 40 hours. The Appendix C diagram shows a permanent pool of water below these volumes. I am a homeowner, not a water drainage expert! Is it true that there will be a permanent pool of water in the detention pond?

- If there is a permanent pool of water, I have the following concerns:
 - How will the water be kept clean of algae and mosquitos?
 - Will there be a fence around it to keep children out?
 - Who will own and maintain it? Page 7 of the report says "The pond will be privately owned and maintained."
- I have trouble envisioning the emergency overflow weir cited on Page 7. Appendix DR-2 seems to show a pipe going into the 24" RCP Storm Sewer (Public). Will this be underground or above ground? If it is above ground, will there be some sort of landscaping to cover it and keep the area attractive?
- A new swale is being proposed right behind my property (Appendix DR-2; I am "62" on the map). The new swale is described under Basin C-1 on page 7 of the main report. Will the proposed swale impact the border of my property at all?

Fourth, I have two concerns about traffic.

- My neighbors have a concern on the location where the new road (Bowling Green Lane) enters Collegiate Drive. I share that concern. There is a dip in Collegiate Drive which creates a blind

FIGURE 5

spot in that area. While I understand the road location is not going to change, is there some mitigation that can help prevent future car accidents in that area?

- In addition, I am concerned about the narrow roads in the new development (Bowling Green Lane and Stanbridge Court). The easement is 50 feet wide – which is the same as the existing street I live on, Mount Union Court. There is a significant difference however. Mount Union Court only has one sidewalk which makes the actual street a bit wider. Bowling Green Lane and Stanbridge Court have 5’ and 6’ attached walks on both sides of the street (see CPC PUD 19-00005, PUD Development Plan, First Drawing). From personal experience, parking is difficult on Mount Union Court. I anticipate it will be even more difficult in the new development. In turn, this might encourage residents to park nearby on Collegiate Drive. Collegiate Drive is one of the main ingress/egress points into University Park and any additional congestion on it could lead to an increase of traffic accidents. Has any consideration been given to having one sidewalk on the side of the two new streets instead of two sidewalks?

Finally, I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts for review and consideration.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth A. Enas

Email: liz.enas@comcast.net

Home phone: (719) 550-8593