
(No subject)

From somethinglikeapersonality@gmail.com <somethinglikeapersonality@gmail.com>

Date Fri 12/6/2024 8:28 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>; Henjum, Nancy <Nancy.Henjum@coloradosprings.gov>

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 City Council/Planning Commission Members,

I am writing to express my support for the proposed changes to zoning laws and the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) ordinance. Increasing housing density through measures like allowing additional units and ADUs is an essential step toward addressing critical issues facing our community, including housing affordability, sustainability, and economic growth.

Higher-density housing aligns with sustainable urban planning principles by reducing urban sprawl, preserving green spaces, and making more efficient use of existing infrastructure. By encouraging walkable communities and reducing reliance on cars, increased density contributes to a greener, more environmentally friendly city.

I urge the City Council to embrace these changes and move forward with bold, thoughtful policies that increase housing density. By doing so, we can create a more affordable, sustainable, and equitable future for Colorado Springs.

Thank you for your attention to this critical matter. I am confident that with the right planning and input, we can balance growth and neighborhood preservation to build a stronger community.

Sincerely,

SE

triplex in the old north end

From robin salley <robinsalleyod@gmail.com>

Date Sat 11/30/2024 5:18 PM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

daniel... say NO to any triplex building in the old north end... it would devastate the historical value of this area...

please do not let this be something YOU would be known for ! robin salley 2015 n. cascade ave

I support the Planning Dept's proposed ADU rules! Also, limits based on "Principal Structure" have lost their "Legitimate State Interest"

From Peter Reaves <preaves20@gmail.com>

Date Wed 12/4/2024 9:24 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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 Daniel Sexton,

I support the Planning Department's proposed ADU Ordinance Amendment. In fact, I believe **the only fair way to limit builds on family lots is to just use existing zoning restrictions, and drop all limits based on "Principal Structure"**.

Break the old guard's control: For too long, a well-established, generally older/retired, very vocal group of citizens has had too much influence over housing policy in Colorado Springs. This "old guard" lives comfortably in their large "primary structures", and they believe they should forever benefit from suburban low-density in urban locations. They feign compromise, but the rules they have allowed effectively defeat almost all builds. It's time to push past them.

Support younger citizens who are too busy to attend City meetings: Meanwhile, younger citizens have moved into smaller "primary structures" in the same neighborhoods, because that's all they can afford with prices way higher now. These younger citizens work and may have kids, and don't have time to organize politically the way the old guard does. You may not hear much from them because they are so busy. Therefore, there is a risk you will get the impression that your constituents are overwhelmingly opposed to the Planning Department's new, relaxed ADU ordinance amendment. Please do not be misled by how vocal the old guard will be on this issue. The old guard has the time/money to make a lot of noise, but please know there are thousands of younger, very busy people out there who need the proposed new ADU ordinance to pass so that they can live comfortably like the old guard does.

Here's why limiting builds by "principal structure" size is unfair to younger generations.

Revisiting the Equal Protection issue: The old guard bought their large houses long ago, when prices were low. They own most of the large "principal structures" in town. Young buyers now are faced with much higher housing costs (relative to avg income), and are therefore usually limited to buying small houses, maybe with plans to add-on later. Because of this uneven house-size dynamic, when addition builds are restricted by "principal structure", young citizens are legally restricted to less living space than older citizens **even when their lots are the same size and their zoning is the same**. "Principal structure" limits seem like an Equal Protection issue the City would want to avoid. The "State Interest" of limiting density has lost its rationality. In fact, the state interest is now reversed: the public policy goal is to increase density to fight the housing crisis, which is undeniably one of the great

public policy issues of our time. There is no longer a "legitimate state interest" to support restrictions based on principal structure size.

Just use zoning restrictions: Zoning restrictions on lot coverage, height, and setbacks are well-designed, accessible, and fair: Please consider dropping all of the additional build restrictions that are "hidden" to most citizens and only serve the old guard. The zoning classification for a property is an accessible piece of data a prospective buyer can easily learn when buying a house. They should be able to rely on that when envisioning long-term plans on the property- rather than having those plans stymied by additional, arcane and complex build restrictions pushed through by the old guard that effectively prevent many younger homeowners from living comfortably in our city. I bet countless citizens have come to the Planning Department in recent years with plans for an addition, only to be informed of a list of "hidden" restrictions that effectively defeat those plans. Citizens deserve clear, fair rules regarding what they can do with their property.

Thanks and best regards,
Pete Reaves

FW: Proposed ADU Zoning Changes - Public Comment

From Wutzke, Mellisa K <Mellisa.Wutzke@coloradosprings.gov>

Date Mon 12/2/2024 1:41 PM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

Hi Dan,

Please see the email below. This is a public comment in opposition for the ADU item.

Mellisa Wutzke

Senior Business Support Specialist

Planning Department

City of Colorado Springs

Office: 719-385-5608

Mellisa.Wutzke@coloradosprings.gov



From: Michele Mukatis <chelesworld@hotmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 2, 2024 1:37 PM

To: Wutzke, Mellisa K <Mellisa.Wutzke@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: Proposed ADU Zoning Changes

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!

Hi Melissa,

Please forward my email to the members of the planning commission. I am very much opposed to the proposal that any house could add two full-sized homes to their lot without any input from the City Planning Department or City Council.

This idea is not well-thought-out. For instance, one question that pops to mind: Why go for two additional and not one? I still believe there should be a process for adding an ADU given that lots come in all shapes and sizes, and different neighborhoods have limitations that others do not.

I am all about infill, but add to neighborhoods by using common sense:

How might it increase traffic, noise, parking issues, environmental problems?

How might it cause a need for more utility infrastructure - lines, sewer water, storm drains due to more impermeable surface and less green land to soak up the rain from these intense storms we get?

There is a requirement for green space when developers add neighborhoods. This should be a requirement to add parks as infill grows in a neighborhood and homeowners need to know that they should be liable to pay for that property to be added.

Clearly, there are a lot of issues that need to be addressed before anything like this should be sent through and added to our code.

Thank you for taking my thoughts!

Michele

--

Michele E. Mukatis
1306 E. Yampa Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80909

Re: Two questions again

From Lynn Peterson <lynpetrson@aol.com>
Date Wed 11/27/2024 1:04 PM
To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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 Dan,

Thanks for replying to my questions. Just to make it crystal clear for me:

- If I were to own a house that covers 50% of the lot, I would not be able to add an ADU to my house or build an ADU (without a variance) because then the total residential coverage would be more than allowed on an R-1 residential lot. Right or no?

Also, with regard to ownership of ADUs, is this statement by Bob Loevy correct? "Wherever there is a single family home in Colorado Springs, the property owner will be able to build two additional single family homes in the backyard and sell them to other owners"

Thanks for responding.

Lynn Peterson

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 27, 2024, at 9:04 AM, Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Morning Lynn,

On behalf of the City's Planning Department, I appreciate the time you took to send us your comments and thoughts on the proposed ADU ordinance. City Planning staff continues to review and work towards the right ordinance for Colorado Springs.

In terms of the questions you raised, the proposed ADU ordinance does not change the maximum lot coverage standards for any zone district. Regarding separate ownership, sale or subdivision of the primary and ADU units we have built in a prohibition of this under the ordinance.

Your comments will be provided to the City's Planning Commission and City Council as they deliberate the ordinance.

Thanks,
Dan

<Outlook-A picture .png>

Daniel Sexton (he/him/his), AICP
Planning Manager

Development Review Enterprise Division

City of Colorado Springs

Office: (719) 385-5366

Cell: (719) 351-1057

Email: daniel.sexton@coloradosprings.gov

[Why Pronouns?](#)

Links:

[Planning + Neighborhood Services Home](#)

[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#)

[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: lynpetrson@aol.com <lynpetrson@aol.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2024 12:42 AM

To: Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin
<Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: Two questions

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!

To either Dan or Kevin,

I was at the ADU meeting last week and thought I heard that an ADU(s) + the primary residence could only cover 50% of an R1 residential lot. Right?

Can an ADU dweller own the ADU he or she lives in? Or could a non-dweller (other than the main property owner) own the ADU? (I do not have Loevy's column in front of me but think I read that there.)

Lynn Peterson
2601 Marilyn Rd.
80909
719-338-7621

https://gazette.com/opinion/letters-challenging-assertions-boards-ill-advised-decisions/article_4a76d100-ae82-11ef-b9b4-57f821572aa6.html

LETTERS: Challenging assertions; board's ill-advised decisions

Gazette readers

Dec 2, 2024



In this file photo, a modular accessory dwelling unit, known as a granny flat or mother-in-law suite, is added to a home.

Courtesy photo: U.S. Modular Inc.

Assertions deserve challenge

I write in response to Dr. Bob Loevy's opinion piece titled, "Think twice before allowing accessory dwelling units behind every home in Colorado Springs" because some of his assertions deserve challenge. First of all, all R-1 property owners would not be moved to put an ADU on his or her property nor would every property owner be allowed to do so. Choice and parameters make it unlikely that an ADU invasion is in the offing. Primary residences, garages and ADU(s) would be allowed to together cover no more than 50% of a residential lot. Obscure exceptions could exceed that. There are many residential lots that would not accommodate an ADU under the proposed rules as numerous properties' built structures are already at or near that level.

Dr. Loevy asserts that single family home property owners "will be able to build two additional single family houses in the backyard and sell them to other owners." This statement is simply not true as the proposed ADU ordinance includes prohibitions for the separate ownership, sale or subdivision of the primary and ADU units. Period.

And, as I understand the proposed ordinance, adding two ADUs would be allowed in quite unusual circumstances.


Given those parameters, perhaps we historic neighborhood folks (arguably, I am one) could consider keeping in mind how unattainable housing is for many of our fellow community members, that allowing homeowners to utilize their property such that housing options could be offered at reasonable prices for people struggling to be able to work and live in Colorado Springs is a net positive. It is economics 101 that increased supply lowers prices. Perhaps young people who aspire to be first time homeowners could now afford to buy a house in an existing neighborhood because they could take advantage of rental income (and it could not be from providing short term rentals). Also, if fewer ADU rules were in place, many homeowners might be more able to afford to stay in place as they age. Isn't that a good thing?

The city's proposed update of ADU allowances fulfills the city's recently adopted comprehensive plan's call to "move our community in the direction of more housing in more places" and to "incorporate a wider variety of unit size, densities, and types." It is a plus that the city is seeking to meet its own goal, one that came about after much community input.

Also, the update addresses the city's previous comprehensive plan's goal (whose task force I served on some 25 years ago) that there be more allowance for people to live close to where they work, shop, eat, and play.

As to schools possibly gaining more students, yay! Dr. Loevy presents enrollment gains as a negative. I beg to differ as increased enrollment engenders increased state revenue to cover educational costs like more teachers.

As to Loevy's assertion that utility costs would be greater if more ADUs are allowed, my understanding is that if fewer extensions of utility lines in support of sprawl are needed, overall utility costs for consumers would be lower not higher. Existing utility lines have available capacity.



In conclusion, I write with a hope that those who have lived here a long time (friend Bob Loevy and I, for instance) and those who have a more recent history might consider being accepting of the city's ADU proposal. Certainly, some reasonable changes to it should be and are in the offing. Change is not easy; but often change needs to be accommodated in order to make a community more integrated and more economically viable for its members.

Lynn Peterson

Colorado Springs

Ill-advised decisions

In the next 24 months it certainly appears that the Pikes Peak Library Board of Trustees will be known for closing both Rockrimmon and Ruth Holley branches. This board will do so even with a surplus in the budget, not a deficit.

What ill-advised decisions: rather than increasing patron access, decreasing it. PPLD has been a wonderful treasured asset and partner with this community for years. This Board has broken that trust and it may never be reestablished again. Shame on them.

James Stolz

Colorado Springs

I would like to expand upon the theme of Robert Blaha's excellent letter.

It seems that Jared Polis wrote to state utilities regulators last month issuing "a powerful warning" about shortfalls in Colorado's electricity capacity. I had to laugh at the temerity of this attempt to portray himself as a moderate, which he manifestly is not. It is like a bank robber who gets away with a heist and then issues "a powerful warning" to the bank about its weak security. Any problems with Colorado's supply of electrons is solely the responsibility of Polis and his fellow radical Democrat legislators in Denver.

They are solely responsible for passing bills that limit our energy supply and he for signing them. He could have vetoed them, but he didn't. He could have reined in his rampant bureaucracy, but instead he expanded it by several thousands state employees, some of them climate fanatics and animal rights extremists.

He then compounded this error by unionizing them, their salaries even now busting the state's budget. The Democrats could easily solve this developing crisis by repealing these misbegotten laws, but they probably will not. They want to force us into using all electric cars and appliances but refuse to provide the necessary supply of electrons. Let's not allow them to portray themselves as innocent bystanders to some vague force majeure. This is what happens when people vote for Democrats.

Fred Cox

Colorado Springs

Two questions

From lynpetrson@aol.com <lynpetrson@aol.com>

Date Wed 11/27/2024 12:42 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

To either Dan or Kevin,

I was at the ADU meeting last week and thought I heard that an ADU(s) + the primary residence could only cover 50% of an R1 residential lot. Right?

Can an ADU dweller own the ADU he or she lives in? Or could a non-dweller (other than the main property owner) own the ADU? (I do not have Loevy's column in front of me but think I read that there.)

Lynn Peterson
2601 Marilyn Rd.
80909
719-338-7621

Proposed City Ordinance for Accessory Dwelling Units

From Louise Conner <louise.conner@hasgardens.org>

Date Thu 12/5/2024 10:17 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>; All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

With respect to the proposed Accessory Dwelling Units ordinance:

1. Why haven't legal notices been given to property owners who own property currently in R-1 and R-2 zones? The proposed ordinance will in effect be changing these zones to R-3.
2. Why hasn't more time been allowed for public process to discuss these sweeping changes proposed by the new ordinance? More public meetings are needed.
3. The proposed ordinance goes beyond what is required by state legislation and needs to be scaled back in keeping with PlanCOS! Specifically:
 - **Limit the number of ADUs allowed on a property to ONE (1). This is the current limit.**
 - **Keep the current height limit of ADUs:** Detached ADU: 25 feet with a flat roof or roof pitch of less than 6:12, 28 feet with a roof pitch of 6:12 or greater. Attached/Integrated: the maximum height requirements of the zone district
 - **Keep the current size limit of ADUs** to 50% of the primary structure or 1,250 sq ft, whichever is less. If the primary structure is less than 1,500 sq ft, the ADU may be 750 sq ft.
 - **Keep the current architectural and design standards** in place and apply to detached ADUs as well.
 - Use as short term rentals not allowed.

The City has ADU code in place. Use that code and change only what State Law requires!

Sincerely,

Louise Conner

712 N Cedar Street 80903

ADU Ordinance Update

From LYNN BEVINGTON <lynnliz1513@msn.com>

Date Tue 12/3/2024 11:24 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>; All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>; Henjum, Nancy <Nancy.Henjum@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

To Whom It May Concern:

I am opposed to the new ADU Ordinance Update. Please do only what is required by the State Law and nothing else. Only one ADU should be allowed on each lot and the ADU should be allowed NO MORE than two bedrooms with a maximum height of 1-story (half the size of the primary home). They should not be used as short term rentals.

Having served on the Colorado Springs Planning Commission I am aware of what squeezing in these ADU's can do to neighborhoods. The idea that there is no off-street parking, no limit to the number of people in the additional home, no consistent design standards and no recourse to fight the building of the ADU is ridiculous!!!! The whole ordinance will significantly impact the quality of living in our neighborhood plus other neighborhoods throughout Colorado Springs. All one needs to do is walk past the duplex now being built on Kiowa St. It exemplifies everything that is bad in planning, bad for the next door neighbors and bad for the entire neighborhood. It's interesting that the Kiowa St. property is owned by someone who lives out of state and rents the current house on the lot as an Air B&B. He doesn't have to live with someone wedged in next to his home and towering over his home as the neighbors do. We have lived in our home for 51 years and care about our neighborhood. Please consider what the new ADU Ordinance will do to our neighborhoods.

Liz and Lynn Bevington
1513 Alamo Ave.
Colorado Springs, CO 80907

ADU Ordinance 24

From Kaylyn Kinney <tooterkk@yahoo.com>

Date Sun 12/1/2024 7:50 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>; All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>; Henjum, Nancy <Nancy.Henjum@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

Hello

I am an Old North End resident voicing **opposition** to the ADU Ordinance 24.

Thank you.

Kaylyn Kinney

ADU requirements

From Katha Murray <katha45@gmail.com>

Date Tue 11/26/2024 7:41 PM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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 Daniel,

I have many concerns about the changes coming from local and state laws impacting density. I understand the need for affordable housing but am greatly concerned that some of the historic or established neighborhoods will lose their charm and even become eye sores.

I have filled out the city survey for ADUs but would also like to see input from neighbors as to heights, view blocking, landscape, and finishes. Will any of this be part of the permitting process?

I find the states idea of allowing more than one additional ADU per lot unacceptable and strongly support 50% or less of current gross building square footage. I fear we could have areas that will soon resemble slums. No area of our city should be blighted.

Respectfully,
Kathy Murray
[Katha45@gmail.com](mailto:katha45@gmail.com)

Opposition to City Allowing A Triplex to be Built on Every Lot in Old North End Neighborhood

From John Haney <haneyjohn3@yahoo.com>

Date Sun 12/1/2024 5:10 PM

To Henjum, Nancy <Nancy.Henjum@coloradosprings.gov>

Cc Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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 Ms. Henjum and Mr. Sexton,

Please add our names to your list of Colorado Springs citizens who oppose the City's allowing a triplex to be built on every lot in the Old North End Neighborhood and Patty Jewett Neighborhood.

Please advocate/vote as follows:

- The City must only do what is required by State Law, nothing more!
- Only one (1) ADU should be allowed on each lot, no more than two (2) bedrooms, maximum height of 1-story, half the size (50%) of the primary home and no use as short-term rentals (STRs).

Thank you.

John & Betty Haney
1211 North Corona Street
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Colorado Springs Mayor and City Council Members:

RE: Proposal to “densify” the City with an ADU Ordinance (2 pages – please read)

My husband and I moved to Colorado Springs 40 years ago. Having lived in crowded, minimal open space places prior to our arrival we have had only deep gratitude for the ratio of natural or landscaped area to the built environment that exists in our city. Colorado Springs, as designed by Palmer, has so far gotten it right in preserving the sense of “living in nature” and not feeling overcrowded – as the city was intended to be a healthy, resort destination. This environment contributes significantly to a sense of well-being and mental and physical health.

My husband practices internal medicine and I am a retired, licensed Landscape Architect with graduate work in urban design and land planning. I have worked with developments such as Kissing Camels, Briargate, the City of Colorado Springs, CS Utilities, etc. The city asked me to write the award-winning Landscape Code. We have both worked hard and volunteered in order to keep the city that we love a healthy place to live for its citizens.

As such, we write to ask you NOT to approve the proposed ADU Ordinance. The cumulative impact on the city will be negative and will change the character, the friendly vibe and healthy sense of living in a place with the right ratio of built and natural environment.

Here are two examples that we have personally experienced: Two negative situations with the ADU development have already taken place on our block. One house was purchased for single family use but the owners moved to another part of Colorado, divided the property into three rental units and now rent it with no supervision regarding what occurs. We neighbors have had to put up with intoxicated renters talking loudly on beautiful summer nights, yelling out, “F...ing this and F...ing that” so much that we had to go inside and close the windows. These renters also come and go late at night as they live different life styles from the families with children that make up the neighborhood.

Another neighbor applied for an ADU, however it was denied so they settled on building a “workout room” – with several variances to dramatically increase the size of the new structure – blocking sunlight and breezes in neighbors’ yards. Once the city was no longer doing any oversight they built a complete ADU with kitchen and bath and put it on the internet as a long term rental, adding congestion to the alley parking and more traffic – in violation of the city’s ruling. The city was oblivious to these actions and the neighbors were counting on that.

I believe that the city will not have the staff to deal with the many abuses that will occur if this change of zoning is approved. The adjacent neighbors will be left to deal with the many cases of noncompliance, noise of unsupervised renters and additional vehicles, light pollution, years of construction activities and of course, loss of environmental quality. Trees will die or be removed for construction. The visual quality of the neighborhoods will be diminished. The temperature in the city will increase with increased hardscape and roof surfaces – likely triggering a need for air conditioners that are also noisy and energy-consuming. Renters typically do not have the same emotional investment and care for the neighborhood as owners do. Also, this ordinance will

Page 2 of 2

encourage outside investors to buy up houses as they are doing in many cities around the country and turn them into permanent, rental properties – destroying neighborhoods and reducing the number of houses available for ownership by individuals and families.

Finally, we citizens have bought carefully in neighborhoods in which we were given the assurance of protective zoning parameters by the city. Where are the architectural guidelines for pleasing appearance and quality materials? It has been our experience that “ancillary” buildings are usually built more cheaply with little regard for appearance or quality construction. Where is any requirement to not negatively impact the environmental quality of the neighbors’ gardens, views, access to sunlight, and proximity to noise? Now, we are asked to have those assurances taken from us as well as probably a significant drop in house resale value if the property is negatively affected by construction next door.

Thank you for reading this long response. I hope that you will have the wisdom not to approve the ADU Ordinance. (Around 1990 I was asked to serve on the City Council- appointed study group to review the proposed interstate scenarios of expansion in the existing location or construction on the east side of the city. Despite a unanimous recommendation to build additional lanes on the east side of the city and to construct a noise absorptive wall by the west side neighborhoods the city and PPACG ignored our recommendations and now we have an awful solution. PLEASE do not ask for citizen input and then ignore it again.)

John and Fawn Bell
1619 Wood Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80907

ADU

From Joan SCHULZ <joansixty@msn.com>

Date Mon 12/2/2024 7:34 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>

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 opposed to the new ADU changes

Joan S Schulz

c ~ 719-235-3481

1325 N. Cascade Avenue

Colorado Springs, CO 80903



ADU Ordinance

From Jim M <jim.medalie@gmail.com>

Date Tue 11/26/2024 4:00 PM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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 Sir,

Please do not go further than the state law requires under this ordinance. Only one ADU per lot, only 1 story, no more than half the size of the primary residence, and no short term rentals.

We love our neighborhood and would hate to see it destroyed.

Thank you for listening and for your understanding.

Regards,

James and Carolynn Medalie
828 N Hancock Ave, Colorado Springs, CO 80903

ADUs

From Janet Carlisle <janet.carlisle@yahoo.com>

Date Tue 11/26/2024 3:48 PM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>; All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

Hi -

I live in the lod north end. Densification of this neighborhood by allowing ADUs will negatively impact this old, wonderful and historic area. The ONEN is one of the largest and most wonderful neighborhoods of it sort in the nation. It's integrity is key to the greatness of Colorado Springs. By allowing new units to enter the area, you would be watering down its beauty. It would no longer be an area of historic significance, but instead a mix of old, new and whatever. You cannot create a new old structure -- this area is amazing because of the richness of it's history, adding new units would dilute its character and lessen its essence. Please don't allow this to happen!!!!

Janet Carlisle

(No subject)

From Jack Keaton <jack.a.keaton@gmail.com>

Date Sun 12/1/2024 8:36 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>; All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>

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 can certainly understand the need for more housing and the need to comply with Colorado law. But I also believe there is room for protection for what most current home owners expected when they invested.

- There is no reason for any ADU to be either bigger or taller than both the residence on the lot OR the primary residences on adjacent lots (to the sides). This doesn't apply to residences across alleys. THIS IS PERHAPS THE MOST IMPORTANT - ALONG WITH SET BACK REQUIREMENTS NOT BEING RELAXED.
- The parking issue should at least contemplate neighborhood situations where there are extenuating circumstances such as a school with its traffic concerns. (example - St Vrain on the block where Columbia Elementary School is located).
- Assume that existing ADUs are grandfathered
- Design requirements? A tough one but there should be some controlling guidelines with regards to what can be seen from the front street side of the property.
- There should be no city requirements beyond what is required by the state law that can be interpreted as allowing higher density or infringement on privacy.

And, in closing, hopefully this is not going to be used to allow any concessions to developers beyond the minimum required by state law.

jack

Jack Keaton

*As I grow older, I pay less attention to what men say. I just watch what they do.
- Andrew Carnegie*

HNP Subcommittee Discussion & Recommendation
COS Proposed ADU Ordinance
5 Dec 2024

HNP General Observations:

- Believes in affordable and attainable housing options for residents.
- Believes in respecting neighborhood character, architecture style and quality of life.
- Recognizes the City has to comply with Colorado HB-1152 but believes the city does not need to **over** comply.
- Recognizes that Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are not **the** answer to housing but can be part of the answer. “Accessory” should be to add living space to the primary dwelling not, effectively, subdivide the lot allowing up to three (3) dwellings equal in size to the primary residence.
- Acknowledges Colorado HB-1152 is seeking a way to provide “**compact** housing” with “**minimal** impacts to infrastructure.” Yet, the proposed City ADU ordinance will allow the population to, effectively, triple in size without equal infrastructure expansion to accommodate such growth.
- Realizes the new ADU Ordinance is a massive city-wide rezoning that impacts approx. 61% of the properties in the city (see Footnote 1).
- Believes such a change in zoning merits a much broader community discussion and a more robust public participation process than what was allocated to this effort.
- Does not support the proposed COS ADU Ordinance, as currently written, for the following reasons:
 - The proposed COS ADU ordinance far exceeds state requirements and conflicts with objectives in the COS Mayor’s 2025 Strategic Plan including “enhance neighborhood character,” “enhance our quality of life,” “centered around community needs and values.”
 - Proposes large density increases, with significant impacts (HB-1152 calls for minimum impacts).
 - Proposes very large heights and sizes for the accessory units (HB-1152 calls for compact housing).
 - Does not stipulate architectural style, building materials or landscaping standards on detached ADUs (HB-1152 allows for standards as long as they are not more restrictive than a single unit detached dwelling in zoning district).
 - As currently drafted, the proposed Ordinance could serve to promote “scrape and builds” of existing affordable homes and result in displacement of current residents.
 - Once approved and implemented, the COS ADU Ordinance establishes a “use-by-right” that cannot be reversed even if the State is challenged on Home Rule violations and the legislation is substantially modified and/or eliminated. Can a sunset clause be established in the COS ADU Ordinance? If so, the proposed ordinance should include a sunset clause.
 - The cumulative impact of the proposed COS ADU Ordinance, Colorado HB-1152 and other state legislation of no parking requirements, no occupancy limits, removal of owner-occupancy requirements and no appeal process is consequential. **This is a significant, not minimal, impact on existing neighborhoods.** Given this, why is COS further compounding the impact by exceeding the state requirements? Do not exceed state requirements.

Regarding the proposed ADU Ordinance:

- By allowing up to two (2) ADUs on any lot in any single-family zoning district, authorized density is being increased threefold (3x). By essentially allowing a triplex to be built on every lot the proposed City ADU ordinance would, over time, crowd out most on-street parking and significantly impact the quality of life and livability of existing neighborhoods.
- A threefold (3x) increase in density results in significant negative impacts to neighborhood infrastructure, character, quality of life and overall safety. The City's aging infrastructure was not built to support such densification and will likely compromise services for all, creating expensive failures and public safety risks.
- Adding two (2) ADUs is effectively flipping single-family residential zoning to multi-family triplex zoning across the entire City. This is not gentle density; this is massive densification.
- Adding 2 ADUs is making single-family lot purchases in existing neighborhoods much more financially attractive to corporate investors. This could increase the number of "scrape and builds" by corporate investors and promote the displacement of existing low-moderate income households in existing neighborhoods.
- The proposed ordinance goes too far in establishing ADUs that are the same size and height of the primary structure. This is not compact housing; this is not cottage housing or tiny housing and definitely not affordable housing. This is large-scale multi-family housing.
- As defined in the City's UDC, an accessory use is supposed to be "subordinate to and serves a principal building." The proposed ordinance allows multiple ADUs that are the same size and height of the primary structure on the lot. That does not make logical sense and is not consistent with the definition of an ADU in the City's UDC.
- Agree with the City's stipulation of no STRs in new ADUs thus orienting the new ADU housing towards affordable and attainable rental housing. It would be self-defeating for the city to incentivize the construction of ADUs to help address the affordable housing problem but allow valuable and extremely scarce construction labor and building materials to be used to build new STR (hotel/lodging) units and not needed permanent housing for residents.
- The ordinance does stipulate architectural standards for attached and integrated ADUs. Does not stipulate architectural style, building materials or landscaping standards for detached ADUs; yet detached ADUs are more susceptible to incompatible style design, colors, building materials and landscaping.

Specific HNP Recommendations:

1. Add a Sunset Clause.
2. Allocate more time to the process for a broader community discussion and more robust public participation. Extend review / approval dates to March.
3. Do not exceed any state requirements.
4. Update the proposed ADU Ordinance with the specifics in the below table under column labeled “HNP Recommendations.”

	COS Draft ADU Ordinance	HNP Recommendations
Number of ADUs per lot	Two (2)	One (1)
Size of ADU	Each ADU is limited to the size of the principal structure. Also, ADUs not counted towards the total gross floor area of accessory structures on the lot.	ADU is limited to 50 percent of the primary structure or 1,250 sq ft, whichever is less. If the primary structure is less than 1,500 sq ft, the ADU may be 750 sq ft
Maximum Height	ADUs allowed to be up to the maximum height of the requirement for the principal building within the zoning district. For nearly all zoning districts that limit would be 35 ft. (Note: For R-4 it is 40 ft and R-5 it is 50 ft.)	ADU allowed to be up to maximum height of 16 ft
Types of ADUs Allowed (e.g. detached/integrated/attached)	Detached, attached and integrated ADUs allowed in all zoning districts that allow single-unit detached homes.	Attached and integrated ADUs are allowed. Detached ADUs are only allowed if height limit is 16 ft.
ADU location on lot	Allowed in rear yard and also in side yard facing street.	Allowed in rear yard only. Not allow in front yard or side yards and no waivers.
Limits on number of bedrooms in ADU	none	Bedrooms should be limited to no more than 2 in the ADU
Use of ADU as an STR	STRs not allowed in ADUs	STRs not allowed in ADUs
Architecture style, building materials and landscaping standards (not more restrictive for ADU than for single unit detached dwelling in the same zoning district)	Only for attached and integrated ADUs	For detached ADUs as well as attached and integrated ADUs

Footnote 1: Based on 2023 US Census Bureau numbers for COS: 134,219 single family detached structures/218,332 dwelling units (of all types) in the City)

ADU opposition to ordinance No. 24

From Amber Niskern <apniskern@gmail.com>

Date Wed 11/27/2024 10:46 AM

To Risley, Brian <Brian.Risley@coloradosprings.gov>; Donelson, Dave <Dave.Donelson@coloradosprings.gov>;
Leinweber, David <David.Leinweber@coloradosprings.gov>; Crow-Iverson, Lynette <Lynette.Crow-
Iverson@coloradosprings.gov>; Talarico, Michelle <Michelle.Talarico@coloradosprings.gov>; OMalley, Mike
(Council Member) <Mike.OMalley@coloradosprings.gov>; Henjum, Nancy
<Nancy.Henjum@coloradosprings.gov>; Helms, Randy <Randy.Helms@coloradosprings.gov>; Friedman,
Samuel <Samuel.Friedman@coloradosprings.gov>; Avila, Yolanda <Yolanda.Avila@coloradosprings.gov>;
Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>

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 City Council,

Please read this as a plea: DO NOT allow ADU ordinance No. 24 proposal to pass.

It will overwhelm our current failing infrastructure, increase safety risks of evacuation from wildfires, and most importantly erode homeowner's rights to the neighborhoods they have created.

I advocate for only one (1) ADU on each lot, one (1) bedroom, maximum height of 1-story, half the size (50%) of the primary home and no use as short-term rentals (STRs).

Thank you for including this email in your required presentation of opposition.

Enthusiastically,
Amber Dawn Niskern
2306 Constellation Dr, Colorado Springs, CO 80906
719-238-5500

ADU Feedback and Questions

From Ed Schoenheit <eds@stetsonhillshoa.com>

Date Tue 11/26/2024 11:53 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

Hello Sir,

Thanks for the call

I did find the City ADU Project page.

Just a couple of notes from the slides and feedback during the planning process.

I'm sure several of these are being worked on and informed from the online survey.

I envision there will be input at the planning commission.

I don't know if there is more push back from the existing large PUDs.

Since we have a large PUD zone area I am a bit concerned about some of the proposed changes that exceed what 24-1152 mandated.

Why is there not a lot size restriction for the 2nd ADU?

Would not 1ac or 2.5ac or large not be considered as reasonable for a 2nd ADU

A 1/4-1/2 ac lot could conceivably still fit multiple ADUs and vastly impact housing density and still not exceed lot coverage %.

The State bill only mandated that jurisdiction allow 400-800sqft ADU. They City already had and exceeded that but the 2nd ADU was not mandated.

If the zoning is not being changed, adding in a 2nd ADU seems to contradict that. Add in STRs and single family becomes multi family rentals with no parking. The City is approving smaller narrower streets and small lots everywhere.

How is the City going to collect drainage basin funds and upgrade costs for existing PUDs and detention ponds impacted by higher density with ADUs? City method for collecting fees is based on acreage not impervious value. PUDs HOA & Metros get stuck with that cost over time or the City will ask for increased Stormwater fees. .

Also schools will not be able to ask for land and only fees but when the schools have to be increased those districts come back to the residents with MIL levy and tax increases for the entire community. Two (2) per lot greatly exacerbate that issue due to housing density and school load.

Is it the City's intent to invalidate the existing bill exemption for existing PUDs to not having to permit ADU as outlined in the State bill through the use of specific City code language? That was noted on the presentation slides. That exceeded what 24-1152 mandated. Is that a Mayoral input decision? That State bill explicitly noted that existing PUD would be exempt unless a local jurisdiction decided to

override that. Who is making that decision and coding that language into the ordinance? This is a huge deal as you know. This then becomes the City breaking faith and development code with existing PUDs.

Thank you
Ed

Thank you
V/R
Ed Schoenheit
Ridgeview at Stetson Hills Master HOA
Board of Directors, President
eds@stetsonhillshoa.com
719-332-9307 (c)

Proposed ADU Ordinance - Public Engagement and Questions

From Dianne Bridges <diannebridges@msn.com>

Date Mon 11/25/2024 8:28 AM

To Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>; Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

Kevin & Dan -

The purpose of this email is to relay some observations about public engagement with regards to the ADU Ordinance update and to ask a few questions about the content of the related survey and commitments.

Regarding efforts by you/your team in reaching out:

1. We appreciate you reaching out to HNP and holding a meeting.
2. We thank you for taking a few questions and allowing some unplanned open, cross-communications during the Public Meeting on 20 Nov.
3. We feel like you/your team are making an effort to involve citizens and listen.

Regarding overall public engagement process:

1. We have two key observations and concerns.
2. The structure established by the City for the 20 Nov public meeting was not conducive to educating the public, nor in our opinion the best way to start the ADU discussions. Citizens first needed more education about the new ordinance so they could understand the proposal and associated impact. This is necessary before asking the public for an opinion and/or to answer a survey. I relayed this to City Comms immediately following the meeting and in a subsequent email.
3. The schedule for public engagement has minimal two-way interaction, is compressed and is challenging with holiday interruptions. Seems unfair to the public, in all honesty
 - o Only one public meeting planned, practically no two-way interaction w/public in open forum w/sufficient time
 - o Only weeks between the one public meeting and Planning Commission
 - o In between these two meetings is Thanksgiving, a down week for many families
 - o Leaving little time to educate, inform and work with residents.
 - o Is the time allowed in the schedule really sufficient to hear differing sides of the proposal and then make adjustments? Isn't it better to come to the Commission & Council with an updated proposal the best approach vs. bickering it out in front of the executives? For example, can't we move the Planning Commission out a bit?

3. This is a complicated change that impacts many individuals across the city.
4. Heavily relying on public input throughout the hearing process is not effective nor seemingly fair for the public has limited time in the hearing process and two-way communications/negotiations are constrained and practically non-existent. For example, in Retool many items were discussed, clarified, compromises reached before going to the Commission and Council. Can we extend the timing to allow this this time?

Regarding the Survey:

- There are key changes not addressed on the survey. For example:
- There is no question on the number of ADUs: 1 or 2. Why was this not included and asked?
- There is a size question about square footage. Good. However, there is no question about height? Why?
- There is no question about the changes in setbacks. Why?
- We recommend questions on number of ADUs, height and changes in setbacks be added.

Lastly, one more question. Commitments were made in the public meeting to do two things:

- 1) share all questions and answers with the public and
- 2) provide a matrix that shows what the State Law requires vs. what COS is proposing (shows the differences and where COS is choosing to over-comply with the State Law).

When will the questions be shared (I assume online and continually updated as additional questions come in)? When will the comparison matrix be completed and posted? It is important to have this information for the public immediately since the City is asking for recommendations/opinions in the survey.

I/we recognize there is a lot in this email. There is a lot in the ADU Ordinance. It impacts many across the City and it feels like many are not fully aware of the details and impact.

Dianne
Chair, HNP

HNP Questions on COS proposed ADU Ordinance

From Dianne Bridges <diannebridges@msn.com>

Date Mon 11/25/2024 9:19 AM

To Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>; Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

 1 attachment (18 KB)

Questions to City Planning ADU 24 Nov 2024 Final.docx;

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!

Kevin & Dan -

Attached please find the HNP questions on the proposed ADU ordinance. The HNP may have additional questions; we thought it wise to get these over sooner rather than later due to the compressed schedule and upcoming holiday.

Is it possible to receive written responses no later than the end of this week and have them posted online? That will afford us/others in the City to see the responses, digest the details and take action before the Planning Commission on 11 Dec.

Please let us know if a particular item on the list is not clear and you need more information.

Thank you

Dianne
Chair, HNP

Re: ADU Ordinance Public & Community Engagement Process

From Dianne Bridges <diannebridges@msn.com>

Date Thu 12/5/2024 4:30 PM

To Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>

Cc Thompson, Thomas <Thomas.Thompson@coloradosprings.gov>; Carleo, Katie <Katie.Carleo@coloradosprings.gov>; Tefertiller, Ryan <Ryan.Tefertiller@coloradosprings.gov>; Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Zink, Vanessa <Vanessa.Zink@coloradosprings.gov>; All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

Kevin -

Thank you for the quick response. And, thank you for posting ADU questions/answers today or tomorrow. That will help with understanding, reducing citizen misperceptions and errors.

I know that you/your team are doing your best. And we are always very appreciative of City Planning's time and efforts to work with us. I spoke up about the ADU process here, not just for our group(s), but for all citizens across the city.

We recognize that many aspects of the end-to-end process concerns outlined below are beyond the direct control of City Planning, e.g., key aspects belong to other city entities like City Council. We also recognize that you/your team have to work within constraints directed by City Council, other City leadership, and dictates from state mandates. I should have made clear both of those acknowledgments in my email below.

Yes, it is true the ADU Ordinance schedule has 6 calendar weeks between the Planning Commission and the formal hearing by City Council. Having said that, the City Council work session is only 4 weeks, and within the 4 weeks there is Christmas week, the New Year week and associated downtimes before, during and after. Even though the public does not speak at work sessions, some of us usually strive to communicate with and inform Council members prior to scheduled sessions. This will be challenging through the holidays, most folks are focused on other life priorities.

All of that aside, we will remain optimistic in general. We are especially optimistic about the separate discussions underway with you, Vanessa and Thomas on improving the overall City Public & Community Engagement. It is exciting to hear that City Communications is also now focusing on public engagement. We are fully committed to that effort and support you/City Planning, City Communications and Community Affairs. We trust that other City entities, like City Council, will ask to be included and will also work to improve their part of the end-to-end public engagement process. The benefits are many for all parties involved.

Thank you, again.

Dianne & Team

From: Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>

Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2024 11:40 AM

To: Dianne Bridges <diannebridges@msn.com>; Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Zink, Vanessa <Vanessa.Zink@coloradosprings.gov>

Cc: Thompson, Thomas <Thomas.Thompson@coloradosprings.gov>; Carleo, Katie <Katie.Carleo@coloradosprings.gov>; Tefertiller, Ryan <Ryan.Tefertiller@coloradosprings.gov>; Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: RE: ADU Ordinance Public & Community Engagement Process

Hello Diane,

Lots to digest here. I can let you know that the FAQs should be posted today or latest tomorrow. Just adding a few based on the erroneous article in the paper on Sunday.

I assure you that we are doing our best to provide as much input as possible. After Planning Commission's opportunity for the public to speak, there will be 6 weeks to the formal hearing by City Council. If they feel that is too rushed, then they have the opportunity to delay. We felt that it was important for us to be as prompt as possible for their consideration given the elections and the state mandated deadline.

I will give you as much time as we can to continue to assist in these processes. I am happy to attend a meeting of your groups if you think that would be helpful. We will also continue to organize this as much as we can to make the input as effective as possible.

I will try to take more time to respond more thoughtfully to your email below in the coming days.



Kevin Walker

Director, City Planning Department

City of Colorado Springs

Office: (719) 385-5347

Mobile: (719) 217-1069

From: Dianne Bridges <diannebridges@msn.com>

Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2024 10:36 AM

To: Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>; Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Zink, Vanessa <Vanessa.Zink@coloradosprings.gov>

Cc: Thompson, Thomas <Thomas.Thompson@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: ADU Ordinance Public & Community Engagement Process

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!

Kevin, Dan and Vanessa -

As you know, next Wed is the Planning Commission on ADU Ordinance. Unless I misunderstand, the ask to the Commission is for recommendation approval of the draft ADU Ordinance. Given this change is city-wide and very impactful, I had previously encouraged you move that decision point to a later date, given the compressed time for the public to fully understand and engage. I have not heard of any change at this point in time and we assume the schedule remains. That is very concerning to us.

To fit in the current schedule, though, today the HNP subcommittee will submit our discussion and recommendations on this topic. With the compressed public engagement schedule overlaid by the holiday, it has been very, very challenging for our organization (and other organizations and individuals across the City) to first digest/read the ordinance, then ask follow-up questions to understand, subsequently complete a survey with an informed position and lastly provide further recommendations on the many items not addressed in the survey. In the case of HNP, we were fortunate to have had one discussion with you to ask very basic questions after a quick, cursory review of the draft ordinance. As you know, we provided in writing additional questions which we have yet to have answered. On 20 Nov, the public asked to have answers to all public questions shared, posted on the website. As of this moment that has yet to occur (at least I do not see them on the site).

How can the public provide informed feedback at this stage? The answers of the incomplete survey will largely be uninformed answers at this point, probably emotion based. On top of that, there has been minimal reach out and communications to citizens across the City. Again, this has a city-wide impact. Where are the mass, repeated communications warranted for such an impactful change? Is there really awareness, much less understanding? Do people really know? Even for those of us who stay close to city activities, we are lacking in full understanding and our paper is submitted without the benefit of complete insights. I am confused over the city handling of this project.

So, here we are. The Planning Commission is yet to make a decision/recommendation next Wed. Statistics will probably be portrayed and used from an ineffectual, incomplete survey. The public has not had sufficient or effective dialog back and forth justified by the significance of this change. On top of that, public representatives are walking into a meeting next week that is NOT two-way, where we are limited to 3 min (unless others cede time). This is wrong.

And, if there is limited to no widespread communications/discussions leading up to the January City Council review/decisions that is even more wrong. The timing of this could not be worse. People are rightly focused on loved ones this time of year; people are weary of external complications, and it makes it so challenging to have such during the holidays.

Holidays aside, it is not effective to constrain communications/dialog and, in turn, reduce understanding. It is not effective to eliminate the opportunity to resolve differences and reach compromise with the City staff before going into the extreme structural limitations of the Planning Commission and Council meetings. The public voice is not fully being heard; it is rather constrained. In addition, the leadership groups do not benefit from a rich dialog on complex issues in advance of their meetings, nor receiving full balanced advice and recommendations from their expert staff and public partners.

The process currently underway with this project is not deliberative engagement. One can easily predict what will unfold: an antagonistic exchange, with constrained frustrated voices and decisions made without full debate and understanding. This is wrong. The widespread impact of the ADU ordinance warrants deliberative engagement with interested parties within and outside city administration.

Why are we doing it this way?

Dianne (and Team)
Chair, Historic Neighborhoods Partnership
VP, Historic Uptown

The old historic District versus zoning changes

From Diane Kunz <diane_kunz@msn.com>

Date Mon 12/2/2024 8:02 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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 believe the old historic district, the old north end, adds character, history and elegance to the city of Colorado Springs. I believe that's why so many people want to live in this area. Changing the zoning and changing the old historic neighborhood seems to be going in the wrong direction.

Thank you for your attention.

From a long time resident of the old north end,

Diane Kunz

Sent from my iPhone



Do not change the zoning in the old north and neighborhood in Colorado Springs

From Diane Kunz <diane_kunz@msn.com>

Date Sun 12/1/2024 7:31 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

Do only what the state law requires.

From a resident in the old north end. Save our neighborhood. It is a historic district. It benefits Colorado Springs.

Sent from my iPhone

Input on ADUs

From CHERYL LEE <cherylllee1217@comcast.net>

Date Wed 12/4/2024 1:10 PM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>

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!

Greetings Mr. Sexton,

Let me introduce myself. My name is Cheryl Lee; I am a native of Colorado Springs, born in Colorado Springs at Penrose Hospital in 1949. I have seen many, many changes in this City over the course of my life.

I grumble a lot as do all old people about change, but rarely do I get involved other than to vote.

Recently, with the discussion about ADU's I would like to share my 74 year old perspective.

I live at 1314 Wood Ave. in a small 1950's rancher. I have an apartment house two doors down from me on the south. Across the street are two apartment houses. In addition there are several short term rentals on Wood Terrace and Wood in my block.

Recently I have had to report cars on the GoCOS! page because the cars have been in front of my house for more than 3 days. Another person I had to talk to because he had parked in front of the fire hydrant. Yesterday I discovered a car blocking my driveway.

1315 Wood has been an eyesore for a long time as its original owners the Merricks grew old and were unable to maintain the property. Their daughter took care of them but the property got worse; it finally ended up being a haven for the homeless who slept under the shrubbery and under the juniper in the median. I have photographs of drug deals in front of the house. I called the police often; mostly they did not respond. Finally about 3-4 years ago the Merrick's daughter lost the house and the "tenants" were evicted. The property was sold and resold. The current owner rents all the units and these people have many cars. The neighbor across the street from 1315 to the south had the good sense to figure out how to get both sides of San Miguel posted restricted parking when 1315 was at its worst. That took away what should be legitimate parking for the 1315 tenants and pushed them to my side of the street.

I am environmentally conscious and that is hard and expensive. I have wanted to put solar panels on my house but the three story house south of me and the tall trees to the north block the sun so it is not cost effective. I can live with this, but adding housing that is 35 feet tall will prohibit other from using solar energy, something at this ADU bill tries to address.

Additional housing in this area will make my quality of life (what little there is left) not so great. With this in mind I would ask that Colorado Springs

- limit ADU's to only one on each lot

- limit the size of the ADU to no more than 2 bedrooms
- restrict the height of ADUs to a maximum height of 1 story
- limit the maximum square footage to no more than 1000 sq. feet
- require new dwellings to be in the backs of properties to assure the beauty of the historic old north end is not disturbed.

I would also ask you to not allow these new ADU's to be used as short term rentals. In fact I think if Colorado Springs did not issue or renew short term rental permits, some of these dwellings could open the market for low income affordable housing. Please consider my suggestions and think about my perspective when advocating ADU policy in Colorado Springs.

Thank you for listening.
Cheryl Lee

Re: New ADU ordinance

From Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>

Date Sun 12/1/2024 9:45 AM

To Donelson, Dave <Dave.Donelson@coloradosprings.gov>; cfp@mcn.org <cfp@mcn.org>

Cc Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Malpica, Johnny P
<Johnny.Malpica@coloradosprings.gov>

Councilor,

Thank you for having this communication from Mr. Peterson. We will add this to the direct emails, the public meeting and stakeholder processes as well as the results of our survey in our presentations to City Planning Commission as well as City Council.

Kevin Walker
Director, City Planning Department
City of Colorado Springs

From: Donelson, Dave <Dave.Donelson@coloradosprings.gov>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 9:17:11 AM

To: cfp@mcn.org <cfp@mcn.org>

Cc: Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: RE: New ADU ordinance

Dear Mr. Peterson,

Thank you for your email. I will keep the "view plane" consideration in mind as we evaluate the ADU ordinance that will come before City Council.

Thank you for pointing this out,

Dave

Dave Donelson
Councilman District 1

City of Colorado Springs
107 N Nevada Ave, #300
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
Office: (719) 385-5487
Cell: (719) 368-0729
Dave.Donelson@coloradosprings.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: City Council - SMB <CityCouncilSMB@coloradosprings.gov>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024 6:33 AM

To: City Council - DL <citycouncil@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: FW: New ADU ordinance

-----Original Message-----

From: Charles Peterson <cfp@mcn.org>

Sent: Friday, November 29, 2024 11:34 AM

To: All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: New ADU ordinance

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!

When writing the ordinance for new ADU units, please prevent new units from blocking the view of Pike's Peak and/or the front range from already developed residential homes. I bought this piece of property because of where I can set a desk in my bedroom and a desk in my office which look out the back side of my house directly at Pike's Peak. The view is fantastic. If you take that away, you take my home away. I am seventy-seven years old, and I don't want to experience that anger and depression.

People deserve housing. I get that. Older people need to be able to have additional units for caregivers and for income. I get that. We need all those condos and apartment buildings. As much as it breaks my heart, we need subdivisions headed east.

It is also okay to have various kinds of housing in various neighborhoods. Please get that.

Anybody can feel free to call me and come take a look. I am a perfect example of why some restriction on ADU development is necessary.

--

Charles Peterson

707-235-9803

We have no reason to ask what will happen to us. We should ask only what we want to happen, and how to make it happen, given the constraints of the moment. – Mark Lilla

RE: ADU Ordinance Update

From Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>

Date Tue 11/26/2024 9:15 AM

To Carla-Rae Smith <crsmith78@gmail.com>; Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>

Thank you Ms. Smith. Appreciate your comments and we review and continue to work toward the right ordinance for Colorado Springs.



Kevin Walker
Director, City Planning Department
City of Colorado Springs
Office: (719) 385-5347
Mobile: (719) 217-1069

From: Carla-Rae Smith <crsmith78@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, November 26, 2024 9:10 AM

To: Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: ADU Ordinance Update

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!

Friends,

As you consider the upcoming update to the ADU ordinance I would advocate that the following stipulations be included:

1. Only one ADU per lot
2. Limit ADU's one bedroom
3. Limit ADU's to a maximum height of 1-story

I believe that the above limits would be a great compromise between maintaining the rights of the property owners, their neighbors and the character of our neighborhoods.

Thank you in advance for considering my opinion,
CR Smith

--

Be peace, be compassion, be joy right now. Thich Nhat Hanh

There are 2 ways to live your life. One is though nothing is a miracle, the other is as though

everything is a miracle. Albert Einstein

Concerns about ADU zoning code changes for residential areas

From Andrew de Naray <andrewdenaray@gmail.com>

Date Sun 12/1/2024 2:15 AM

To Sexton, Daniel <Daniel.Sexton@coloradosprings.gov>; Walker, Kevin <Kevin.Walker@coloradosprings.gov>; All Council - DL <allcouncil@coloradosprings.gov>

Cc nancy@nancyforcos.com <nancy@nancyforcos.com>; Henjum, Nancy <Nancy.Henjum@coloradosprings.gov>

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 City Councilors,

I am very concerned about the upcoming ADU zoning code changes for residential areas. I understand that some of this is mandated by recent changes to State law. However, I also understand that the City is adding more to the code beyond what's mandated by the State.

I am *not* against the addition of ADUs to existing structures per se, but I feel there need to be stipulations to assure that such structures will not infringe on neighbors' privacy or overwhelm already-challenging street parking conditions.

I am *NOT* okay of the following changes proposed by the city, and have added a "why" for each:

- ADUs being used as short-term rentals. Short-term rentals do not strengthen neighborhoods and contribute to street parking overload.
- The removal of the owner occupancy requirement, which appears to mainly benefit short-term rental owners using added ADUs as additional short-term rentals alongside preexisting short-term rentals. Again, short-term rentals do not strengthen neighborhoods and contribute to street parking overload.
- Allowing the addition of multiple ADUs with no limits on the number of residents allowed to live within each, and removing the requirement of an additional off-street parking space for an ADU. This will overwhelm street parking since no off-street parking is required by the State law.
- ADUs that are the same size/taller than the existing residence. This will result in windows that overlook neighboring back yards, reducing privacy therein.
- ADU approval to be an administrative process and not appealable. This gives neighbors little to no recourse to argue how a proposed ADU structure may affect their quality of life.

Thank you,
Andrew de Naray
Owner of 1302 E Platte Ave. for 18 years