

## Van Nimwegen, Hannah

---

**From:** Lorraine Goldstein <lorrainegolds@me.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 9, 2019 1:27 PM  
**To:** Van Nimwegen, Hannah  
**Subject:** Pony Park Residences

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,

Is there a way to see the configuration of these homes? I cannot attend the meeting but it seems to me these will be so close to each other you could visit from windows. I am very concerned with guest parking. If 1/2 of the homes have 2 guests with cars then that means 36 guest parking spaces will be needed. That's not counting any homeowners who might have more than 2 cars. Are guests going to be allowed street parking? That would be a no from me.

The traffic at the corner of Pony Tracks and Peterson is already congested in the morning with the school and people going to work then again in the afternoon when school gets out. We have parents parking at the park, both sides of the street, because there is no place to pick kids up at the school.

This plot of land is just not big enough for 36 homes it's just cramming them in for a builder to get rich. There won't be quality of life and they will do absolutely nothing for the neighborhood but make more traffic.

This builder has no care about a neighborhood and what this number of houses will do. I would probably be inclined to seriously consider nothing over 12/18 homes.

In closing I want to tell you that people have jobs and can't take time off sitting in a room waiting until who knows when to be heard. VERY SNEAKY. MAKES ONE WONDER WHO THE CITY WORKS FOR!

Thank you very much.  
Lorraine Goldstein  
3140 Flying Horse Rd  
80922

Sent from my iPhone

## Van Nimwegen, Hannah

---

**From:** Campbell, Karen D CIV NORAD-USNC CS (USA) <karen.d.campbell16.civ@mail.mil>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 9, 2019 9:28 AM  
**To:** Van Nimwegen, Hannah; Dorse DuBois  
**Cc:** Michael Van Winkle; Kathryn Duff; Marie Baker; Joanne Springer; linda Wallis; Kristin Smith; Terri Villa; Dave Mork; Patricia Tigner; karmay22@aol.com; Chris MacMillan; Carol Lavoie; Dan McGovern; Cindy Opong; Greta Brisk; Tena Stetler; brucerents@aol.com; Rmustang14@aol.com; Charla Hawkins; Kevin Abbott; Lisa Tietz; Anna DuBois  
**Subject:** RE: [Non-DoD Source] RE: COMMENTS: PONY PARK RESIDENCES FILE #'s: CPC PUZ 19-00006 & CPC PUD 19-00007

UNCLASSIFIED

I completely agree with all the concerns regarding traffic flow, safety, parking, etc. However, no one seems to be concerned with health issues for the surrounding home owners during construction. Our home is located on the south end of the property, several of the planned homes will face my backyard. My husband after having a heart transplant suffers from breathing/lung issues. When the proposed construction begins, there will be any number of mold/bacteria spores released into the air. At this point I have no idea how this will affect my husband's health. But I am sure that it will adversely affect him. I am sure that there are other individuals that live in the surrounding area, that might experience the same health issue. Yet no one seems to be concerned. I did bring this up at the last "town hall" type meeting but did not receive a response to my concerns. Also, we had to close off the access gate to our backyard for fear that someone would decide to just open the gate and walk in on yard. Has there been a study done on air quality and noise level during the proposed construction?

Karen Campbell

UNCLASSIFIED

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

**From:** Van Nimwegen, Hannah <Hannah.VanNimwegen@coloradosprings.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 9, 2019 8:57 AM  
**To:** Dorse DuBois <dorse@mannateksolutions.com>  
**Cc:** Michael Van Winkle <mrwv47@gmail.com>; Kathryn Duff <kjduff128@gmail.com>; Marie Baker <marie\_baker@uhc.com>; Joanne Springer <joannespr3@gmail.com>; linda Wallis <lswallis1@outlook.com>; Kristin Smith <kristin.smith8@icloud.com>; Terri Villa <tavilla@yahoo.com>; Dave Mork <daveinbagram@mac.com>; Patricia Tigner <ptigner@aol.com>; karmay22@aol.com; Chris MacMillan <calanmacmillan@hotmail.com>; Carol Lavoie <carolavoie@yahoo.com>; Dan McGovern <dmcgovern2@gmail.com>; Cindy Opong <onajourney9@gmail.com>; Greta Brisk <gretabrisk@gmail.com>; Tena Stetler <tenajejan@aol.com>; brucerents@aol.com; Rmustang14@aol.com; Charla Hawkins <jhawk818@hotmail.com>; Kevin Abbott <dr.kaco@live.com>; Campbell, Karen D CIV NORAD-USNC CS (USA) <karen.d.campbell16.civ@mail.mil>; Lisa Tietz <lisatietz@yahoo.com>; Anna DuBois <anna@mannateksolutions.com>  
**Subject:** [Non-DoD Source] RE: COMMENTS: PONY PARK RESIDENCES FILE #'s: CPC PUZ 19-00006 & CPC PUD 19-00007

## Van Nimwegen, Hannah

---

**From:** Dorse DuBois <dorse@mannateksolutions.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, August 9, 2019 7:39 AM  
**To:** Van Nimwegen, Hannah  
**Cc:** Michael Van Winkle; Kathryn Duff; Marie Baker; Joanne Springer; linda Wallis; Kristin Smith; Terri Villa; Dave Mork; Patricia Tigner; karmay22@aol.com; Chris MacMillan; Carol Lavoie; Dan McGovern; Cindy Opong; Greta Brisk; Tena Stetler; brucerents@aol.com; Rmustang14@aol.com; Charla Hawkins; Kevin Abbott; Campbell, Karen D CIV NORAD-USNC CS (USA); Lisa Tietz; Anna DuBois  
**Subject:** COMMENTS: PONY PARK RESIDENCES FILE #'s: CPC PUZ 19-00006 & CPC PUD 19-00007

**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 Hannah;

Please see the additional feedback regarding the Review Criteria For PUD Development listed below. Can you please confirm receipt and that this feedback will be included in the review of the Planning Board? We do not wish to lose all of the input provided thus far and need to ensure a true, honest, fair, and complete process moving forward after the past disaster led by Mr. Shultz...

### **7.5.603: Findings (Review Criteria For Zone Change)**

Establishment or Change of zone District Boundaries: A proposal for the establishment or change of zone district boundaries may be approved by the City Council **ONLY** if the following findings are made:

1. The action will not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience or general welfare. *The current design layout submitted by the developer includes parking spaces along the east side of Flying Horse RD. This street happens to be located within the Springs Ranch HOA boundaries where none of the neighbors on the street are allowed to park vehicles along Flying Horse RD. overnight. The HOA does issue parking tickets and send violation notices whenever vehicles are left parked on this street and surrounding streets overnight. **Some residents in this HOA have had liens placed on their property in the past for non-payment of levied fines from issued parking tickets.** Potential residents of the Pony Park Development, parking vehicles along Flying Horse RD. would:*

- *Not be in the public interest*
- *Creates a nuisance to the existing neighbors and an INCONVENIENCE with potential tickets, fines/penalties, notices to deal with, and potential liens to fight against. This creates an undue burden upon the neighboring communities. Again, negatively affecting the General Welfare...*
- *Negatively effects both SAFETY & GENERAL WELFARE for all of the neighbors living on this street and surrounding areas. Having vehicles parked on this street creates a hazard for traffic flows, obscures vision for drivers with children present, and narrows the space on the street to maneuver.*

*During the recent meeting, Mr. Mike Schultz cited a couple "High Density" "Small Lot" projects located in the surrounding area as positive examples in support of the Pony Park development, yet he could not answer the question of when is it too much, or at what point do we reach saturation? All of the neighbors seem to agree that we are already beyond the saturation level. We live here and experience the increased crowding each and every day. Does it seem appropriate for a bureaucrat who does not live here, determine for us what our saturation level should be? He could not even tell*

*us what the saturation level would be. What method, i.e. how would he determine this, just appear to pull an arbitrary number out of thin air? This too is NOT in the public interest, creates a safety hazard, is very INCONVENIENT, and negatively affects GENERAL WELFARE.*

### **7.3.606 PUD Development Plan**

#### **C. Compatibility of the Site Design with the Surrounding Area:**

7.3.606, C, 1. Does the circulation plan minimize traffic impact on the adjacent neighborhood?

- *Again, having vehicles parked along Flying Horse RD. creates a hazard for traffic flows, obscures vision for drivers with children present, and narrows the space on the street to maneuver. These are clear safety concerns which cannot be ignored.*

7.3.606, C, 2. Do the design elements reduce the impact of the project's density/intensity?

- *Clearly the opposite is at play here. The design elements only INCREASE the density/intensity and do not attempt to minimize the impact; maximizing the number of residences for maximum profit, with the smallest lot sizes available in the entire city.*

7.3.606, C, 3. Is the placement of buildings compatible with the surrounding area?

- *The developer does not know what buildings are going to be put in the small lots as they are not the builders. No guarantees = ambiguity and problematic*
- *What they have indicated as examples are not at all compatible with lot sizes, houses, or buildings in the surrounding area. Even the configuration presented was inconsistent with the neighboring design.*

7.3.606, C, 4. Are landscaping and fences/walls provided to buffer adjoining properties from undesirable negative influences that may be created by the proposed development?

- *There are no fences nor walls along the western edge of the development to provide a buffer to the neighbors across the street.*

#### **D. Traffic Circulation:**

7.3.606, D, 1. Is the circulation system designed to be safe and functional and encourage both on and off site connectivity?

- *By Mr. Schultz own words, he admitted that the Pony Park development would be smaller lots than others such as Cascades. These other "small lot" developments cited do already present safety hazards and are not functional at all for emergency and fire responders. Case in point: Summer 2018, The fire department was called to respond to an emergency at Cascades, firetrucks were unable to maneuver and pull up to the home in need. This had several eye witnesses present, and saw the crew have to run up to the property to provide aid needed.*

7.3.606, D, 3. Will adequately sized parking areas be located to provide safe and convenient access, avoid excessive parking ratios and avoid expanses of pavement?

- *NO. The current design provides for parking along Flying Horse RD. which are too narrow, was not designed for on-street parking. Furthermore, the Springs Ranch HOA has policies in place that do not allow for overnight parking by neighbors.*
- *The additional on-street parking of vehicles on Flying Horse RD. creates a safety hazard for children playing in the area, and for people driving or maneuvering on the same street.*

E. Overburdening of Public Facilities: Will the proposed development overburden the capacities of existing and planned streets, utilities, parks, and other public facilities?

- *The entire neighborhood has been at full capacity for many years, and is simply oversaturated based on the original Master Plan. So definitely, the streets, parks, and schools would be 'OVERBURDENED'.*

F. Privacy: Is privacy provided, for residential units by means of staggered setbacks, courtyards, private patios, grade separation, landscaping, building orientation or other means?

- NO. The houses facing west towards Flying Horse RD. have no setbacks, are completely open to the street, have no grade separation, nor private patios.

Dorse and Anna DuBois

PLEASE INCLUDE THIS PREVIOUS FEEDBACK FROM OTHERS AS WELL:

*There are 8 items of the Pony Park Residences proposal that do not meet the project review criteria for approval:*

### **7.5.603: Findings (Zone Change)**

7.5.603, B, 1. The action will not be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience or general welfare.

*The change in zoning will be detrimental to the public safety and convenience of the residents and neighborhood. The proposal is for 36 units in an area where the number of units in neighboring areas is at most about 24 units. This is 150% the density of the most dense part of the surrounding area. The much higher density of this development will result in unmanageable traffic congestion resulting in danger to pedestrians (children going to/from school with parents/guardians) as well as more road rage incidents. The city has a responsibility to only allow development where the general welfare and safety of the public will not be impaired.*

### **7.3.606 PUD Development Plan**

#### **C. Compatibility of the Site Design with the Surrounding Area:**

7.3.606, C, 1. Does the circulation plan minimize traffic impact on the adjacent neighborhood?

*This plan will have a major negative impact on the local traffic. The proposal feeds most vehicles from the property out to Pony Tracks half a block from a lighted intersection with Peterson Rd. During morning and afternoons vehicles going to and from the local Remington Elementary are already causing traffic problems. This high density development will add about 70 new vehicles to this problem. A MODELING/SIMULATION INVESTIGATION DOES NOT EQUAL AN ACTUAL TRAFFIC STUDY!!!!*

7.3.606, C, 2. Do the design elements reduce the impact of the project's density/intensity?

*There is nothing in the design elements that reduce the impact of the projects very high density. The large stormwater detention area at the front corner would be an eyesore and dangerous attraction to children from Springs Ranch Park across the street. A few shrubs will not reduce it.*

7.3.606, C, 3. Is the placement of buildings compatible with the surrounding area?

*The building placement is nothing like those in the surrounding area. The nearby lots contain single family homes with a setback front yard, private back yard, and considerable space between units. In this development the units have no front or back yard, are placed tightly together, and have no private outdoor space at all. Residents are expected to share a communal green space where they'd have to bring their chairs out to sit outside and then bring them back in when done. Hopefully there are lockable storage sheds provided so their yard stuff doesn't get stolen.*

#### **D. Traffic Circulation:**

7.3.606, D, 1. Is the circulation system designed to be safe and functional and encourage both on and off site connectivity?

***Most of the traffic flow to and from the site will be via Pony Tracks half a block from Peterson Rd. The exit to Flying Horse will mostly be used as an emergency exit in case of fire or blockage of the Pony Tracks exit. Because of the close proximity to the traffic light at Peterson, there will be thick congestion of traffic in mornings and afternoons in this area. It will result in more unsafe conditions for pedestrians crossing the driveway and impair the function of the circulation both on and off site.***

7.3.606, D, 3. Will adequately sized parking areas be located to provide safe and convenient access, avoid excessive parking ratios and avoid expanses of pavement?

***Because of the large number of units and the small size of the property, there will be overflow parking along neighboring streets for visitors. The design of the parking areas in the diagram shows considerable expanses of pavement. REMEMBER!!! THERE'S AN EXISTING HOA WHICH REQUIRES NO PARKING OF VEHICLES ALONG FLYING HORSE RD. THIS WOULD BE A HUGE PROBLEM AND CAUSE UNNECESSARY AND INACCURATE TICKETING OF CARS ASSOCIATED WITH STREET ADDRESSES!!!***

E. Overburdening of Public Facilities: Will the proposed development overburden the capacities of existing and planned streets, utilities, parks, and other public facilities?

***Streets: yes. Parks: yes. The traffic on Pony Tracks at Peterson is already at maximum mornings and afternoons because of the school, so the high number of additional vehicles (with 36 units, about 70 extra cars) will be added. Since such a large number of people in these units will have no private yard, and only a small communal outdoor area, they will need to use Springs Ranch Park next door whenever they want more outdoor space to have a barbecue or play games. This will overburden the capacity of the park.***

F. Privacy: Is privacy provided, for residential units by means of staggered setbacks, courtyards, private patios, grade separation, landscaping, building orientation or other means?

***There is no privacy since the units don't even have little enclosed patios. They're not staggered, there's no grade separation or landscaping between units. There are only a couple of communal lawn areas ("courtyards"?) that are very small.***

Regards,

Dorse DuBois  
Vice President Mannatek Solutions, Inc.  
Mobile: (719) 964-3557  
Office: (719) 591-6031  
Web: [www.mannateksolutions.com](http://www.mannateksolutions.com)

## Van Nimwegen, Hannah

---

**From:** Martin Haines <marty80922@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 4, 2019 10:14 AM  
**To:** Van Nimwegen, Hannah  
**Cc:** Schultz, Michael; Schultz, Michael; m h  
**Subject:** Pony Park Residences – CPC PUZ 19-00006, CPC PUD 19-00007, AR FP 19-00023

**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;  
Hannah Van Nimwegen, AICP Senior Planner

I am very concerned about the impact of this project is going to have on our nice quiet neighborhood I have lived here for 4 years and had intended on staying.

I'm going to retire in 5 years, but that is not the planning dept. concern. That park across the street has a high volume of visitors during the Summer months. Sports and family parties. I mention this because I skimmed over traffic report, 105 pages of estimates of traffic based on different mock scenarios. This is real life, not a model. I didn't see any actual counting done on traffic.

Also, there is an issue with this project coexisting with our current HOA. We don't have a lot of rules here, but maintaining clear streets is one of them. No overnight parking! This has kept our neighborhood very nice, no junk cars parked on the streets and yards. Weeds kept to a minimum, which needs to be addressed.

This project looks like a bunch of HUD homes to be truthful, like the projects. The Builder and the designer could not stop contradicting each other about building luxury homes or affordable. Scares us when at the meeting I pointed this out to both of them. Yes, I attended the last meeting.

Now this 4 acres was originally sold to, practically given to the Jehovah's Witness Church 20 years ago, I hope they made a lot of money off this deal. I mention this because I think they picked the wrong Denomination to give the land to, that's why we never had a church built there, but it was zoned for a Place of Worship. Now I see it was already zoned for Residential and needs to be rezoned for tiny little high density homes. Why do you think it was zoned that way in the beginning? Tax write off possibly?

So this developer wants to be greedy and build as many homes as they can in a 4 acre lot. It started out as Townhouses, then to 38 small lot houses, to 36 currently. with common areas and parking?

To summarize:

I disagree with this project because they have underestimated the number of parking needed for each house and I don't think that is going to coexist with our HOA rules of "no overnight parking" on those adjacent streets.

I think the traffic report is underestimating the real traffic on Pony Tracks and needs an actual counter put down on the street at all close intersections.

I think this High Density project is going to be an eyesore and be sold to investors, who will rent most of the units. Who buys such a property? Not a migrant population, they rent. This has no common amenities like a pool or gym, just common areas. I really think they need to have a marketing strategy, but that's not your problem at Zoning, but it is ours in the neighborhood when we have a transient population living close. It will be like living by cheap apartments.

I disagree with a developer being greedy, not putting the community's safety and beauty first. He's just trying to make a buck.

There was no mention of them having an HOA or joining with our's. Where are they going to put trash receptacles out? Our HOA has contracted with Springs Disposal to keep traffic down of the many Waste Companies trucks, but I still see a few cutting through on our streets. These are things I feel are important, but at Zoning probably only have certain things to check off.

This is much more complicated than just a few things to check off.

I invite you to drive by our area and the Project they are comparing it to on the opposite side of Peterson. Is this the way we want our Friends to live? That project has negatively impacted that area, look at the parking, cars on the streets, there is a different HOA on that side.

This also comes at the time we are Rezoning the Golf Course. This is way too much for our neighborhood to just standby and let "Progress" take over.

I thank you very much for reading this, it is very important to me because my Home is 3092 Pony Tracks Drive. Yes this project is going to negatively impact my Life and neighbors, there is many of us opposed to this "Project"

Sincerely,  
Martin Haines



## Van Nimwegen, Hannah

---

**From:** G and A Brown <gbab819@msn.com>  
**Sent:** Saturday, August 3, 2019 9:38 PM  
**To:** Van Nimwegen, Hannah  
**Subject:** File Numbers: CPC PUZ 19-00006; CPC PUD 19-00007

**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!**

Ms. VanNimwegen,

I am writing concerning the Files in the Subject above. The project called: Pony Park Residences at 3055 Flying Horse Road, C.S. 80922.

All of our surrounding neighborhoods are jammed packed with our houses being very close together. To have some open space and or parks is necessary to feel some "relief" from these tight living spaces. To "jam in" 36 homes in to the proposed location is absolutely crazy. We need that space to be utilized in a way that ALL residents can use if it were at least made in to a nicely landscaped sitting area, with walkways etc. There is a playground/park across the street and that helps, but, putting in all those homes will "crowd" the park situation with traffic and just "too close" to the kids and families playing there.

All decent "planned communities" have open spaces and parks, etc, to give families relief from the overcrowded housing builds that we have now.

I strongly believe that this is a terrible idea and should be rejected for the sake of all the families involved, esp. the kids. That last small parcel of land that was never built on....must have been left that way for a reason. It should be utilized in a way that families can enjoy it....not be crunched in even more by all the homes in such a small area...adding traffic and congestion in to a very small area.

Approving this build is just not "good common sense" in my humble estimation. I've been around the world....and lived many places. I'm 70 yrs old and have seen my share of well designed communities and others.....well, not truly done well. Congestion will also be an issue for the middle school right across the street. It's already a traffic issue when school starts each day, mid day, and at 3:00 in the afternoon. This proposed bill has so many negatives for our community. The only positives are for those profiting from the selling of the homes, and the taxes, etc, etc.

Thank you for taking the time to read my thoughts.





## Van Nimwegen, Hannah

---

**From:** Kathryn Duff <kjduff128@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 15, 2019 8:23 AM  
**To:** Van Nimwegen, Hannah  
**Cc:** Dorse DuBois; Michael Van Winkle; Marie Baker; Joanne Springer; linda Wallis; Kristin Smith; Terri Villa; Dave Mork; Patricia Tigner; karmay22@aol.com; Chris MacMillan; Carol Lavoie; Dan McGovern; Cindy Opong; Greta Brisk; Tena Stetler; brucerents@aol.com; Rmustang14@aol.com; Charla Hawkins; Kevin Abbott; Campbell, Karen D CIV NORAD-USNC CS (USA); Lisa Tietz; Anna DuBois  
**Subject:** Re: 8:30 AM PUBLIC MEETING???? COMMENTS: PONY PARK RESIDENCES FILE #'s: CPC PUZ 19-00006 & CPC PUD 19-00007

**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!**

Hannah,

I am appalled at the dishonest and unethical approach to this public meeting. I have done as you suggested and reached out to my district rep on City Council.

I am concerned about the process regarding public comments being included in the official record. Your office stated public comments would be accepted and included prior to August 15, 2019. Yet, you stated that the report had already been completed and that any additional comments (even those submitted up until today) would NOT be included in the report that the Commission reviews. That is disturbingly unethical and gives the perception of a rigged system. Perhaps your office should review the legal ramifications and social implications of deceiving the citizens of the community by being intentionally dishonest and misleading.

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend this meeting and voice my extreme opposition to the proposed development. The duplicitous behavior exhibited by the Planning department has essentially silenced the voice of the community directly impacted by this proposal. You and your colleagues should be ashamed of yourselves.

Furthermore, I will be contacting several media outlets to encourage a thorough investigation by their journalist team into the corruption that seems to run rampant through our local governing bodies. I encourage fellow members of my community included in this email thread to do the same.

I expect to be notified of the acceptance of the proposal as it seems that it was due to be accepted from the start regardless. It is a shame that the voices of our community are deemed worthless in favor of the \$\$\$ from shady developers (Rockwood Homes doesn't even have BBB accreditation and has complaints lodged against them on several different platforms.)

"No man who is corrupt, no man who condones corruption in others, can possibly do his duty by the community." - Theodore Roosevelt

Kat Duff  
3082 Pony Tracks Dr

Sent from mobile device. Please excuse any typos.

On Aug 12, 2019, at 9:33 AM, Van Nimwegen, Hannah <[Hannah.VanNimwegen@coloradosprings.gov](mailto:Hannah.VanNimwegen@coloradosprings.gov)> wrote: