



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

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

Appellant Contact Information

JULIE C PRICE (+ OTHER HOMEOWNERS) 703-200-8180
Name of Appellant Phone Number

10565 SLUMBER RIDGE WAY COLO SPRGS CO 80908
Address (Include City, State, ZIP)

julie.c.price @ comcast.net
Email

Project Information

OLD RANCH ROAD STORAGE
Project Name

PARCEL NUMBER: 6222300007
Site Address (TSN if not yet addressed)

NEW DEVELOPMENT PLAN
Type of Application Being Appealed

DEPN-22-0021
All File Numbers Associated with the Application

TAMARA BAXTER
Project Planner's Name

Hearing Date

Item Number on Agenda

Appellant Authorization

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

Julie C Price
Signature of Appellant

7/21/2025
Date



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Appeal Submittal Should Include:

All Items Are Required

- ☒ Completed Appeal Form (this document).
- ☒ Evidence of "Affected Party" Status – check the box below and provide justification for the chosen box.
- ☒ Notice of Appeal (see requirements on page 3 of this document).
- ☒ \$176 check payable to the City of Colorado Springs. **TAMARA SAID COULD BE DONE ONLINE**

Submit all 4 items above to into the Accela review system - <https://aca-prod.accela.com/COSPRINGS/Default.aspx>.

Appeals are accepted for 10 days after a decision has been made. Submittals must be received no later than 5pm MST on the due date of the appeal. Incomplete submittals and / or submittals received after 5pm or outside of the 10-day window will not be accepted. If the due date for the submittal falls on a weekend or federal holiday, the deadline is extended to the following business day at 5 pm MST.

If you need additional assistance with this application, please call the Land Use Review front desk at (719) 385-5905.

Affected Party Status

Please indicate, per UDC Subsection 7.5.415.A(1)(a) (Right to Appeal), which of the definitions of "Affected Party" that applies to the Appellant.

- ☐ (1) The applicant for the decision being appealed;
- ☒ (2) The owner or tenant of a lot or parcel of land located within one thousand (1,000) feet of the subject lot; or
- (3) Any owner or tenant of a lot or parcel of land located within three (3) miles of the subject property who has preserved standing by:
 - ☐ (a) Testifying at the public hearing on the application; **NONE HELD!**
 - ☒ (b) Submitting written comments prior to the public hearing on the application; or
 - ☐ (c) In the case of applications approved by the Manager or an administrative official, submitting written comments to the Manager or administrative official during the comment period before the Manager or administrative official's action.



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Notice of Appeal

The Notice of Appeal Shall State:

- (1) The specific provision(s) of this UDC that is the basis of the appeal;
- (2) Which of the following criteria for reversal or modification of the decision is applicable to the appeal:
 - (a) The decision is contrary to the express language of this UDC;
 - (b) The decision is erroneous; or
 - (c) The decision is clearly contrary to law; and
- (3) Describe how the criteria for the relevant application have or have not been met.

~ provided in attachment:

- COUNCIL APPEAL STORAGE FINAL - 20250721

~ also attached:

- OLD RANCH STORAGE APPEAL SIGNATURES
 - ~ Community in agreement of appeal
- PETER LANGE PAVE MURPHY EMAIL TRAFFIC
 - ~ Notes City to require community meeting

Appeal Amendment for DEPN-22-0021

Project: Old Ranch Road Storage

Appellant:

The community was placed at a clear and unfair disadvantage by the City's failure to disclose, until after the submission of this appeal, that the project would be reviewed under the previous Chapter 7 standards rather than the new Unified Development Code (UDC).

The actions of the City in this matter are nothing short of egregious. Information crucial to the community's understanding and participation in the appeal process was casually close but not communicated in an official capacity. Failing to disclose the relevant source material and code standards governing the project from the outset, the city has not only undermined the community's efforts but has also demonstrated a blatant disregard for transparency and fairness.

The community deserves better; we deserve a planning team that values their input and ensures they have access to all necessary resources to advocate effectively for their rights and the integrity of their neighborhood. This situation demands immediate rectification and accountability for the mismanagement of information that should have been readily available.

At no point before the short appeal window was it communicated to residents or community representatives about which version of the code would govern the review of this project. The city staff or those directly involved are familiar with such nuances in the planning process but failed yet again to make them available in official public notices or outreach materials.

As a direct result, the community's appeal and all related work were prepared in good faith using the only available, public-facing legal standards, the UDC. Informing us after the fact that a different, older code applies is not just a procedural misstep; it constitutes a substantive unfairness and deprives residents of a meaningful opportunity to participate on an equal footing.

The City's after-the-fact disclosure of the governing code undermines public trust and raises serious concerns about transparency, due process, and equity in the planning process. This appeal should not be prejudiced or dismissed on technical grounds that were not disclosed to the public before the close of the appeal period.

At a minimum, residents should be allowed to revise their statements, and the Council should consider the equities of applying new code standards in light of the prolonged and opaque process.

Additionally, the Planning Commission acknowledged on multiple occasions that Old Ranch Storage is adjacent to critical habitat for the ESA-protected Preble's jumping mouse (<https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/4090>) but fails to disclose or study the effects of the project on its surroundings.

The Plan fails to address the negative impact this project will have on the Preble's jumping mouse, specifically through habitat destruction, increased noise, and light pollution.

Further, runoff from the development will affect the Pine Creek and Kettle Creek watersheds. Development also creates a large area of impermeable surface, which prevents rainwater from recharging the aquifer.

Detriment to Public Interest, Health, Safety, Convenience, and General Welfare (7.5.603.B.1)

- The proposed storage facility introduces an industrial-scale, commercial use at the edge of a high-density residential neighborhood. Its massing, fencing, and lighting are fundamentally incompatible with the character and expectations of adjacent communities.
- The project is expected to generate an estimated 750 vehicle trips per day, with over 50 trips during peak hours, placing an undue burden on local residential streets that are not designed for such high intensity. The proposed site entrance has been flagged by the City's own Traffic Engineering division as unsafe and noncompliant, lacking required sightline documentation and proper gate placement.
- The introduction of 24/7 operations and high-output lighting threatens to increase late-night traffic, crime risk, and significant light pollution, directly undermining the welfare and peace of neighboring families and wildlife habitats.
- The developer has proposed open metal fencing rather than solid masonry walls, which do not meet neighborhood standards and thereby fail to provide adequate buffering, privacy, and transition, directly conflicting with longstanding expectations for compatibility.

Inconsistency with the Comprehensive Plan (7.5.603.B.2)

- Contravention of Community Goals: The Comprehensive Plan and related master plans emphasize the protection of neighborhood character, ensuring compatible infill, and

mitigating the negative impacts of non-residential development. The proposed facility directly violates these principles by introducing a non-integrated, visually discordant structure into a residential gateway.

- **Failure to Advance Community Livability:** The project does not make a positive contribution to the neighborhood's fabric. Instead, it creates a harsh, commercial edge and fails to provide amenities, transitions, or features that would support the goals of livability, walkability, or a harmonious built environment.
- **No Demonstrated Community Need:** The application fails to establish a community-based need for this type of development at this sensitive, residential location, nor does it address the absence of local precedent for similar commercial uses.

Inconsistency with Master Plan(s) (7.5.603.B.3)

- Lack of Alignment with Adopted Master or Sub-Area Plans: Where master plans or neighborhood frameworks exist, this proposal is inconsistent with stated objectives to protect residential edges, provide transition areas, and avoid adverse impacts from incompatible commercial development.
- No Master Plan Amendment or Justification: If the proposal is inconsistent, it should require an amendment or additional justification, which has not been provided or supported by community engagement.

Locational Criteria for Mixed-Use Not Applicable (7.5.603.B.4)

- Not a Mixed-Use Zone: Although this criterion does not directly apply, it is notable that the proposed facility is purely commercial, rather than mixed-use, and thus offers none of the community or transitional benefits that mixed-use development is intended to provide.

Appeal Statement for DEPN-22-0021

Project: Old Ranch Road Storage

Appellant: Julie C. Price and Community in Area of Project

Failure to comply with the city code

The project is non-compliant with UDC § 7.5.515, which mandates compatibility with surrounding land uses and requires buffering to minimize impacts. This project achieves the opposite:

- This is a storage facility inserted into a residential neighborhood. Any commercial development must consider the character and feel of the surrounding residences. The proposed development is not compatible with the area.
- Typically, commercial developments that abut neighborhoods are professional offices and shops (restaurants, dentists, hardware stores, etc.) that enhance rather than detract from the area.
- The storage facility introduces incompatible fencing along Old Ranch Road and the east property line, ignoring the solid wall standards set by adjacent communities.
- It fails to harmonize with neighborhood character, introducing industrial materials, lighting, and security fencing at the gateway to a family-oriented, residential area.
- There is no meaningful transition or mitigation between the storage facility on the east and north property line shared with The Townes at Kettle Creek, a solid perimeter wall already exists. Instead of proposing a redundant, visually discordant fence, the developer failed to propose a suitable solution or integrate it into the existing wall structure, thereby compromising continuity, privacy, and compatibility.

Further, under UDC § 7.1.103(a), the development fails to preserve neighborhood identity or protect residents from incompatible adjacent use. It does not promote welfare; it actively undermines it. There is a clear departure from the Uniform Development Code. The City is bound by its laws. There is no legal or moral basis for this approval to stand.

The city planning department **failed** to facilitate a community meeting

The Planning Department failed to facilitate a meeting between residents and the developer before advancing and approving this project. That meeting never happened. Emails confirming this promise are attached.

The initial notice was two years ago. The city planner departed from their role at the city, failed to properly hand off the project, and the community believed the project was canceled.

Contrary to the community's belief, the project continued. The community did not receive subsequent notices that the project was back on and slated for approval. The process requires notice so that neighbors can have an opportunity to be heard. The UDC requires posted and mailed notices. It is absurd to suggest that notice from years in advance or publications in the Colorado Springs Gazette satisfy the requirements of the code when the previous notices were clearly posted on the site, and the community was previously provided ample lead time.

The City's UDC explicitly requires formal mailed notice to all property owners within 1,000 feet of the proposed project site, as outlined in UDC § 7.5.403.F and § 7.5.406.C–D. These requirements are not discretionary and were not provided to the surrounding neighbors. The city failed to perform its due care in providing the community with official notices.

An email sent to a select few individuals or neighborhood groups does not fulfill this legal obligation and is not considered valid public notice. Email is informal, incomplete, and easily missed, and it does not reach all affected property owners as required. Further, several neighbors who previously filed did not receive the email from the city planner.

Without notice and a public hearing/meeting, there was no meaningful input, no public collaboration, and no transparency. Instead, the project was approved despite the community objections. That alone is grounds for reversal. The process is flawed, opaque, and conducted in bad faith.

If the City relied on email in lieu of mailed notice, the approval process is procedurally defective and must be vacated. Any action taken without proper notification is invalid and must be reversed.

Misaligned and incompatible architectural design

The proposed project introduces harsh, incompatible commercial features, a complete mismatch with the residential character surrounding it. To date, no effort has been made to propose an integrated architectural style, visual tone, or material palette for the neighborhood.

The plan calls for a six-foot metal security fence (Fence Type #2) along Old Ranch Road, directly across from a solid wall that defines the community standard, not only for the Kettle Creek community, but also the Pine Creek community. The east boundary is also mismatched,

introducing a jarring break in the established design. This is not a minor detail; it is a deliberate disregard for context.

If this were a business park or highway corridor, the decision might be justified for a business park; however, the monolithic commercial facility will be built at the entrance of a residential neighborhood. That is unacceptable, and the approval must be reversed.

The developer's proposal to install an open metal fence along the north side of the property is entirely inconsistent with the existing solid masonry walls that define the surrounding residential communities.

Along the east property line shared with The Townes at Kettle Creek, a solid perimeter wall already exists. Instead of proposing a redundant, visually discordant fence, the developer failed to propose a suitable solution or integrate it into the existing wall structure, independent of the landscaping addition, thereby compromising continuity, privacy, and compatibility.

Any fencing or perimeter treatment along the north boundary, which is directly visible from public rights-of-way and adjacent homes, must match the established standard of solid privacy walls, not metal, iron, or other commercial-grade alternatives.

The City cannot allow the introduction of lower-quality materials that break the visual integrity of the neighborhood. This is not a business park. This is the edge of a high-density, family-oriented residential community. If the developer seeks approval, they must meet, not undercut, the existing standard.

Unrestricted 24/7 operations endanger neighborhood safety and quality of life

No other local business operates around the clock in this area, and there are no commercial buildings nearby. The approved storage facility project would invite off-hour traffic, increased light pollution, and elevated security risks. Residents have not asked for "reasonable accommodation."

We clearly state that 24/7 or discretionary hours of operation are unacceptable, and we do not favor prioritizing business convenience. It's about preserving livability of the residents of the community.

The community disagrees with the City's position that this project will not increase motor vehicle traffic on surface streets, namely Rhinestone Drive, Kettle Ridge Drive, and Looking Glass Way. The project proposes approximately 500 storage units, which, based on national ITE trip generation rates, are expected to result in an increase of 750 vehicle trips per day, including over 50 trips during the evening peak hour alone.

The streets above are residential corridors not engineered for that level of intensity, especially from a commercial site without operating hour restrictions, an improperly placed entrance gate, and no ingress or egress from Old Ranch Road.

The City's own Traffic Engineering division flagged the proposed site entrance as unsafe and noncompliant, specifically noting the lack of required sightline documentation and the proximity of the gate to Rhinestone Drive.

It remains unclear if these concerns, raised multiple times, are addressed in the latest submittal.

The following Traffic Engineering comments remain unanswered:

1. *"Please show and call out 'on this sheet' the speed line of sight with the adequate sight distance length (footage) for the proposed access."*
2. *"The gate shown at the proposed entrance access is too close to Rhinestone Dr. Please locate the gate at a minimum of 50 feet from the flow line and provide an open median for U-turn vehicles."*

Combined with the project's scale of over 500 units, undefined operating hours, and location at a key residential intersection, the access issues pose an unacceptable traffic and safety burden on surrounding residents. Approval must be reversed until these fundamental engineering deficiencies are corrected.

The applicant's lighting plan proposes the use of a variety of fixtures with a lumen output ranging from 1,000 to 3,000, all of which are downward-facing. However, it fails to specify the total quantity, placement, or cumulative photometric impact on the surrounding neighborhood. This omission is critical.

High-Output Lighting Plan Poses Residential Nuisance

Not only are the structures themselves incompatible, but the light pollution from harsh, bright security lights also has a significant negative impact on the night skies and the adjacent wildlife conservation area.

While individual fixtures may comply in isolation, the combined intensity of dozens of high-output lights, operating 24/7, represents a significant risk of light pollution, particularly to the adjacent residential properties to the north, west, and across Old Ranch Road.

Without a complete photometric study, including spillover analysis at the property boundaries, the City cannot accurately assess compliance with UDC requirements for site compatibility, buffering, and neighborhood protection.

Furthermore, the use of high-lumen commercial-grade lighting at the edge of a residential community is inherently incompatible with the quiet, low-light character of the surrounding area. At a minimum, the project must be required to:



- Submit a full lighting photometric plan,
- Implement shielded, low-glare fixtures, and
- Limit lighting operation hours to match restricted access hours.

As it stands, the proposed lighting configuration is incomplete, unregulated, and incompatible, contributing to the growing evidence that this project is not ready for approval.

Demand for action

This appeal is not a negotiation. The City's process failed to include the community. The project omits multiple sections of the UDC despite the city planner's assertions. Residents were ignored and continued to be ignored. The storage facility is incompatible with its surroundings, and neither the city planning department nor the developer has shown any willingness to meet even the most basic standards of compatibility.


The council must overturn the City's administrative approval, and the community demands that the City Council do its job: enforce the law, protect our neighborhood, and require any future development to meet the same standards residents are held to every day.



1,400 S.F.




FENCE TYPE #1
6' SOLID SCREENING/PRIVACY FENCE




E TYPE #2
TAL SECUI


OLD RANCH ROAD STORAGE
(MINI WAREHOUSE STORAGE FACILITY)




BUILDING "I" - OFFICE (SOUTH)
DD-2 1/8" = 1'-0"




BUILDING "I" - OFFICE (WEST)
DD-2 1/8" = 1'-0"




BUILDING "I" - OFFICE (NORTH)
DD-2 1/8" = 1'-0"



BUILDING "I" - OFFICE (EAST)
DD-2 1/8" = 1'-0"



BUILDING "I" - FLOOR PLAN
DD-2 1/8" = 1'-0"



TRASH ENCLOSURE
DD-2 3/16" = 1'-0"



Design Development
Consultants @
1310 FORD STREET
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80915
(719) 570-1456


Revisions	DATE
DESCRIPTION	5/2/24
RESUBMITTAL	
3	

OLD RANCH STORAGE
10545 RHINESTONE DRIVE
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO


DATE 2/28/2025
CHECKED DCW
DRAWN BY MC
OFFICE PLANS & ELEVATIONS

CITY FILE NO.: DEPN-22-0021


OLD RANCH ROAD STORAGE (MINI WAREHOUSE STORAGE FACILITY)




NORTHERN EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'A'
1/8" = 1'-0"




SOUTHERN EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'A'
1/8" = 1'-0"



EASTERN EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'A'
1/8" = 1'-0"



WESTERN EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'A'
1/8" = 1'-0"



BUILDING A UNIT LAYOUT / FLOOR PLAN
1/8" = 1'-0"

BUILDING 'A' UNIT COUNT

UNIT	SIZE	QTY
UNIT A	5x5	6
UNIT B	5x10	15
UNIT D	10x10	28
UNIT F	10x20	15
TOTAL UNITS		64



CITY APPROVAL STAMP









CITY FILE NO.: DEPN-22-0021

Revisions	DATE
DESCRIPTION	5/2/24
RESUBMITTAL	
#	

—STANDING SEAM
METAL ROOFING



OLD RANCH ROAD STORAGE (MINI WAREHOUSE STORAGE FACILITY)



Design Development
Consultants @
1310 FORD STREET
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80915
(719) 570-1456
(C) ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Revisions	DATE	DESCRIPTION
#		
1	5/2/24	RESUBMITTAL

D2-0308

OLD RANCH STORAGE
10545 RHINESTONE DRIVE
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO

DP


DATE 2/28/2025
CHECKED DCW
DRAWN BY MC

BUILDINGS 'C' & 'J'
CONCEPTUAL
FLOOR PLAN AND
ELEVATIONS


05 OF 16

CITY FILE NO.: DEPN-22-0021


OLD RANCH ROAD STORAGE (MINI WAREHOUSE STORAGE FACILITY)




NORTHERN EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'D'
DD-4 302' x 14'




SOUTHERN EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'D'
DD-5 302' x 14'



WESTERN EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'D'
DD-6 302' x 14'



EASTERN EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'D'
DD-7 302' x 14'



BUILDING D UNIT LAYOUT / FLOOR PLAN
DD-8 302' x 14'



BUILDING B UNIT COUNT		
UNIT	SIZE	QTY
UNIT D	10'x10'	14
UNIT E	10'x15'	10
UNIT G	10'x20'	10
UNIT H	10'x35'	14
UNIT I	12'x40'	5
TOTAL UNITS		53

CITY APPROVAL STAMP

CITY FILE NO.: DEPN-22-0021

Revisions	DATE	DESCRIPTION
#	5/2/24	RESUBMITTAL
3		

D2-0308

OLD RANCH STORAGE
10545 RHINESTONE DRIVE
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO



DP

DATE 2/28/2025
CHECKED DCW
DRAWN BY MC

BUILDING 'D'
CONCEPTUAL
FLOOR PLAN AND
ELEVATIONS


06 OF 16

OLD RANCH ROAD STORAGE (MINI WAREHOUSE STORAGE FACILITY)




NORTH EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'E'


SOUTH EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'E'



EAST EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'E'



WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'E'



BUILDING E UNIT LAYOUT / FLOOR PLAN



UNIT	SIZE	QTY
UNIT A	5'x9'	8
UNIT B	6'x10'	16
UNIT C	8'x10'	20
UNIT D	10'x10'	28
UNIT E	10'x15'	28
UNIT F	10'x20'	14
TOTAL UNITS		86

CITY APPROVAL STAMP

CITY FILE NO.: DEPN-22-0021



Design Development
Consultants @

1310 FORD STREET
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80915
(719) 570-1456

Revisions	DATE
#	5/2/24
3	RESUBMITTAL

OLD RANCH STORAGE

10545 RHINESTONE DRIVE
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO

D2-0308


DP

DATE 2/28/2025
CHECKED DCW
DRAWN BY MC


BUILDING 'E'
CONCEPTUAL
FLOOR PLAN AND
ELEVATIONS

07 OF 16


OLD RANCH ROAD STORAGE (MINI WAREHOUSE STORAGE FACILITY)




NORTHERN EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'F'




SOUTHERN EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'F'



EAST EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'F'



WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'F'



BUILDING F UNIT LAYOUT / FLOOR PLAN

	SIZE	QTY
UNIT B	5'x10'	16
UNIT E	10'x15'	17
UNIT F	10'x20'	30
UNIT G	10'x25'	17
TOTAL UNITS		80

CITY APPROVAL STAMP

CITY FILE NO.: DEPN-22-0021

T-BONE
CONSTRUCTION, INC.
GENERAL CONTRACTOR


Design Development Consultants @
1310 FORD STREET
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80915
(719) 570-1456

Revisions	DATE	DESCRIPTION
#	5/2/24	RESUBMITTAL
3		


OLD RANCH STORAGE
10545 RHINESTONE DRIVE
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO

DATE	2/28/2025
CHECKED	DCW
DRAWN BY	MC
BUILDING 'F' CONCEPTUAL FLOOR PLAN AND ELEVATIONS	


OLD RANCH ROAD STORAGE (MINI WAREHOUSE STORAGE FACILITY)




NORTH EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'G'




SOUTH EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'G'



EAST EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'G'



WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'G'




BUILDING 'G' UNIT LAYOUT / FLOOR PLAN

BUILDING 'G' UNIT COUNT		
UNIT	SIZE	QTY
UNIT A	5'x5'	10
UNIT B	5'x10'	16
UNIT D	10'x10'	17
UNIT E	10'x15'	16
UNIT F	10'x20'	9
TOTAL UNITS		70


CITY APPROVAL STAMP

CITY FILE NO.: DEPN-22-0021


OLD RANCH ROAD STORAGE (MINI WAREHOUSE STORAGE FACILITY)




NORTH EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'H'




SOUTH EXT. ELEVATION - BUILDING 'H'



EAST EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'H'



WEST EXTERIOR ELEVATION - BUILDING 'H'



	SIZE	QTY
UNIT A	5'x5'	6
UNIT D	10'x10'	27
UNIT E	10'x15'	12
UNIT F	10'x20'	10
TOTAL UNITS		55

BUILDING H UNIT LAYOUT / FLOOR PLAN



CITY FILE NO.: DEPN-22-0021

T-BONE
CONSTRUCTION, INC.
GENERAL CONTRACTOR

Design Development Consultants @

1310 FORD STREET
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80915
(719) 570-1456

Revisions	DESCRIPTION	DATE
#	RESUBMITTAL	5/2/24
3		

OLD RANCH STORAGE

10545 RHINESTONE DRIVE
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO

DATE: 2/28/2025

CHECKED: DCW


DRAWN BY: MC

BUILDING 'H' CONCEPTUAL FLOOR PLAN AND ELEVATIONS

10 OF 16

LIGHT FIXTURE SCHEDULE										
MARK	HANDJ.	MODEL	LAMP			MOUNTING	DESCRIPTION	VOLTAGE	TOTAL WATTS	NOTES
			QTY.	WATT	TYPE					
WPT	LTH08A	APCT LED P2 40K	1	16.5	LED	SURFACE	WALLPACK	120	16.5	

CALCULATION ZONE STATISTICS						
DESCRIPTION	SYMBOL (ft)	AVERAGE (ft)	MAXIMUM (ft)	MINIMUM (ft)	MAX./MIN. (ft)	AVG./MIN. (ft)
PAVED AREA	*	1.1	2.5	0.2	12.5:1	5.5:1
TO PROPERTY LINE	*	0.2	4.9	0.0	N/A	N/A



McShea Consulting, LLC
MECHANICAL • ELECTRICAL • PLUMBING
4445 Northpark Dr. Suite 200
Colorado Springs, CO 80907
mcsheaconsulting.com
Project #: 22 - 6659

REVIEW SET
NOT FOR CONSTRUCTION



T-BO
CONSTRUCTION
GENERAL CONTRACTOR
(719) 570-1456

**Design Development
Consultants @**
1310 FORD STREET
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80915

Revisions		
#	DESCRIPTION	DATE

D1-8171

OLD RANCH STORAGE
NE CORNER OF OLD RANCH ROAD AND RHINSTONE DRIVE
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO

DD'S

DATE	APR. 12, 2022
CHECKED	MRM
DRAWN BY	GLW, CCF

LIGHT FIXTURE AND PHOTOMETRIC SITE PLAN

SP0.1


NOTE: AN IRRIGATION PLAN WILL BE PROVIDED UPON APPROVAL OF THE FINAL LANDSCAPE PLAN.
 NOTE: ALL STREET TREES AND STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS LOCATED IN THE ROW WILL BE MAINTAINED BY THE PROPERTY OWNER.
 NOTE: LANDSCAPE IMPROVEMENTS AND MAINTENANCE SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF OWNER, AND/OR THEIR ASSIGNS.
 NOTE: A FINAL LANDSCAPE AND IRRIGATION PLAN SHALL BE SUBMITTED AND REVIEWED CONCURRENT WITH A BUILDING PERMIT SUBMITTAL AND APPROVED PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT.
 NOTE: THE LANDSCAPE CONTRACTOR SHALL COORDINATE WITH THE DESIGN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT REGARDING THE REQUIRED SOILS ANALYSIS REPORT AND IS RESPONSIBLE FOR COMPLETING THE SOILS SAMPLING AND SUBMITTING THE SAMPLES TO A SOILS TESTING LAB FOR TESTING. THIS WOULD INCLUDE A SEPARATE LAB TEST REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS (AMENDMENT/FERTILIZER AMOUNTS AND APPLICATION RATES) FOR EACH TYPE OF PROPOSED LANDSCAPING (SHRUB/SOD/NATIVE SEED). THE SOILS LAB RESULTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ARE REQUIRED TO BE REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE DESIGN LANDSCAPE ARCHITECT AND THE CITY OF COLORADO SPRINGS PRIOR TO INSTALLING ANY LANDSCAPING (PLANTS/SOD/NATIVE SEED) ON SITE.
 NOTE: THE MINIMUM SOIL AMENDMENT AMOUNTS ARE AS FOLLOWS: (CU per 1,000 SF) FOR AMENDMENTS (TYPE - CLASS 1) FOR NATIVE SEED (AT LEAST 3 CU per 1,000 SF), SHRUB BEDS (AT LEAST 3 CU per 1,000 SF) AND SOD AREAS (AT LEAST 4 CU per 1,000 SF). THESE AMOUNTS MAY CHANGE BASED ON THE FUTURE SOILS REPORT.

AREA IS ZONED: R5

SITE IS ZONED: PBC

AREA IS ZONED: PUB
 BISON RIDGE AT KETTLE CREEK FILING NO. 4
 REC. NO. 215713574

LEGEND
 PLANNED INFILTRATION AREA



POWERS BOULEVARD
 REC. NO. 20247097
 & REC. NO. 202175543

LANDSCAPE SETBACKS				SITE CATEGORY LANDSCAPE CALCULATIONS			
STREET NAME OR ZONE BOUNDARY (ELEV.)	STREET CLASSIFICATION	WIDTH (IN FT.) REQ./PROV.	LINEAR FOOTAGE	TREE / FEET REQUIRED	NO. TREES REQ./PROV.		
POWERS BLVD	EXPRESSWAY	25 / 25	544	1 / 20	28 / 28		
OLD RANCH RD	MINOR ARTERIAL	20 / 20	327	1 / 25	14 / 14		
SHRUB SUBSTITUTES REQ. / PROV.	ORNAMENTAL GRASSES REQ. / PROV.	SETBACK PLANT ABBR. DENOTED ON PLAN			% GROUND PLANE VEG. REQ. / PROV.		
N.A.	N.A.	SB			75 / 75		
MOTOR VEHICLE LOTS							
NO. OF VEHICLE SPACES PROVIDED	SHADE TREES (1 / 15 SPACES) REQUIRED / PROVIDED	VEHICLE LOT FRONTAGES		LENGTH OF FRONTAGE (FT.) EXCLUDING DRIVEWAYS			
23	MIN. 3' SCREENING PLANTS REQ./PROV.	EVERGREEN PLANTS REQ. / PROV.		LENGTH OF SCREENING WALL OR BERM PROVIDED			
N.A.	N.A.	N.A.		N.A.			
VEHICLE LOT PLANT ABBR. ON PLAN	PERCENT GROUND PLANE EG, REQ./PROVIDED						
W	N.A.						
INTERNAL LANDSCAPING							
NET SITE AREA (SF) LESS PUBLIC R.O.W.	% MINIMUM INTERNAL AREA	INTERNAL AREA (SF)		INTERNAL TREES (1 / 500 SF) REQ./PROV.			
208,832	5	10,442 / 25,121		21 / 16			
SHRUB SUBSTITUTES REQ. / PROV.	ORNAMENTAL GRASSES REQ. / PROV.	INTERNAL PLANT ABBR. DENOTED ON PLAN		% GROUND PLANE VEG. REQ. / PROV.			
50 / 50	N.A.	IN					
LANDSCAPE BUFFERS AND SCREENS							
STREET NAME OR PROPERTY LINE (ELEV.)	WIDTH (IN FT.) REQ./PROV.	LINEAR FOOTAGE		BUFFER TREES (1 / 20') REQ./PROV.	EVERGREEN TREES REQ. (50%) / PROV.		
NORTH PROPERTY LINE	15 / 15	503		26 / 26	13 / 14		
RHINESTONE DRIVE	15 / 15	491		25 / 25	13 / 13		
LENGTH OF 6 FT. OPAQUE STRUCTURE REQ. / PROV.	BUFFER TREE ABBR. DENOTED ON PLAN	% GROUND PLANE VEG. REQ. / PROV.					
	BTN						
	BTR						
*BTN= SCREENS AN EVERGREEN TREE IN THE NORTH BUFFER, BTR= REFERS TO AN EVERGREEN ALONG RHINESTONE DRIVE.							

115 North Wacker Street
 Colorado Springs, Colorado 80908
 719.586.8800
 www.garzaandassociates.com
 info@garzaandassociates.com

PROJECT NAME: OLD RANCH STORAGE
 PROJECT ADDRESS: RHINESTONE DRIVE
 PROJECT CITY/STATE: COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80908
 PROJECT DESCRIPTION: DEVELOPMENT PLAN

DATE: 07/20/2024
 DESIGNED: GSK
 CHECKED: WTS

REVISIONS

DATE	BY	DESCRIPTION
07/20/2024	GSK	INITIAL 10% DEVELOPMENT

PLAN SCALE: 1" = 30' (AS NOTED ON PLAN)

SHEET NO. 1
 PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLAN
 1 of 2 SHEETS
 FILE NO. FILE#

A map of the study area showing Kettle Creek, Rhinestone Dr, Old Ranch Rd, and N. Powers Rd. A north arrow and a scale bar (1 inch = 2000 feet) are included.

PREPARED FOR
VINTAGE COMMUNITIES, INC.
4779 N. ACADEMY BLVD
COLORADO SPRINGS, CO 80918
DEAN VENEZIA
719-491-2158

J.R. ENGINEERING
A Westlan Company



Centennial 303-740-9888 • Colorado Springs 719-580-2588
Fort Collins 970-491-8888 • www.jrengineering.com



SHEET 1 OF 1		H-SCALE 1"=40'		No. REVISION		BY DATE	
JOB NO. 25211.00		V-SCALE N/A					
OLD RANCH STORAGE FLING NO. 1		DATE 02/12/25					
PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN		DESIGNED BY PAL					
		DRAWN BY PAL					




LEGEND

 PLANNED INFILTRATION AREA

 BUILDING ELEVATION CHANGES




CITY FILE NO. DEPN-22-0021



Know what's below.
Call before you dig.

OLD RANCH STORAGE FILING NO. 1

PRELIMINARY UTILITY AND PUBLIC FACILITY PLAN



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

From: Dave Murphy

Sent: Monday, September 19, 2022 3:39 PM

To: peter.lange@coloradosprings.gov

Subject: Re: File No. DEPN-22-0021

Hi Peter,

I live at 10605 Ouray Creek Point, adjacent to the proposed mini storage lot. I am very concerned because I do not think another storage facility will add value to our wonderful neighborhood. There is already a storage facility across Powers less than a mile away. This lot is surrounded by nice homes and a storage facility does not belong. I strongly oppose this proposed development. Please do not approve this development.

Dave Murphy

From: Dave Murphy

Sent: Tuesday, September 20, 2022 1:36 PM

To: peter.lange@coloradosprings.gov

Subject: Fwd: File No. DEPN-22-0021

Peter,

Please confirm you have received this email.

Thank you for taking the time to talk with me over the phone. I am obviously not happy about this proposed development and would like to be updated with any near future planned meetings, petitions to disapprove etc.

As we discussed, I live on the end cap adjacent to the vacant lot and I am very concerned about a buffer zone, lighting, 24 hr usage, type of clientele and just the overall use. There is already a large self storage facility on Powers just down the street! I'm sure the owner and the City can find a much better development that compliments the neighborhood.

Again, I strongly urge you to deny this project.

From: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2022 5:15 PM
To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: RE: File No. DEPN-22-0021

Peter,

I met you at your office last week regarding the proposed mini storage development. I'm not sure if this is true but I have heard that this is your last week and you are moving? If this is true, who will be taking over this proposed project?

Thanks,

Dave Murphy

From: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Sent: Monday, September 26, 2022 5:49 PM
To: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Subject: RE: File No. DEPN-22-0021

Hi Dave,

I'm not sure who said that, but that is incorrect information. I am not moving anywhere. I'll still be your point of contact.

-----Original Message-----
From: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 5, 2022 3:01 PM
To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed mini storage development

DAVE & JENN MURPHY
10605 OURAY CREEK PT.

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 Peter,

Just checking in to see what is new with the applicant after the overwhelming neighborhood opposition? Please update me with any potential upcoming hearings.

Thanks,

Dave Murphy

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 6, 2022, at 2:45 PM, Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:
Hi Dave,

There are no upcoming hearings at the moment. I am releasing the initial departmental comments tomorrow and the applicant will need to address the departmental comments as well as the general public comments.

You all will receive public notices when we get closer to a hearing for this item.

On Oct 13, 2022, at 7:43 AM, Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

The comments haven't been released to the applicant yet so I won't be able to send them over just yet.

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

From: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 13, 2022 8:42 AM
To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed mini storage development

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!

Good Morning...

Can you please send me the initial departmental comments you referenced below?

Thanks.

Sent from my iPhone

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

From: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 27, 2022 6:36 PM
To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed mini storage development

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 Peter,

Have the comments been released to applicant? If so, please forward to me.

Thanks,

Dave

Sent from my iPhone

Dave Murphy

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 2, 2022, at 10:11 AM, Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Once I receive the application payment the comments can then be released.

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

From: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 2, 2022 10:00 AM
To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed mini storage development

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!

Ok thanks...but didn't you last say that initial departmental comments would be sent out?

Sent from my iPhone

On Nov 2, 2022, at 8:05 AM, Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Morning Dave,

I have been out of the office for the past week so I need to go through my email for confirmation of the application payment. I don't think I've seen it just yet but I'll confirm.

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

From: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Sent: Monday, November 28, 2022 9:50 AM
To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed mini storage development

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 Peter,

Hope you had a nice Thanksgiving.

Any update on the application payment and released City comments?

Thank you

On Nov 28, 2022, at 4:37 PM, Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hi Dave,

Hope you had a nice Thanksgiving as well.

I tried reaching out to the developer again about a week ago and I haven't heard back from them. I will probably give them a call by the end of the week to get an update on their application status.

Thanks.

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

From: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Sent: Thursday, January 5, 2023 10:32 AM
To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed mini storage development

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 Peter,

Can you give any updates on the proposed development above?

Thanks.

Dave Murphy

Sent from my iPhone

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

From: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 2:46 PM
To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed mini storage development

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

Thanks Peter but I'm confused. I thought the overwhelming dissent from the surrounding neighborhoods was enough to deny their request? Please send me the Staff's initial comments.

Dave

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 15, 2023, at 4:54 PM, Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Dave,

We send the comments to the applicant in a separate email and have them respond to your comments in a response to comment letter.

They are aware of your feedback.

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

From: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 4:53 PM
To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed mini storage development

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

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

From: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 7:50 PM
To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Proposed mini storage development

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

Ok. Will you please email me when the community meeting is scheduled? I am traveling and don't want to miss in mail. Appreciate it.

Sent from my iPhone

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

From: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>
Sent: Thursday, March 16, 2023 8:56 AM
To: Dave Murphy <dave@bernsteinmurphy.com>
Subject: RE: Proposed mini storage development

Hi Dave,

Sure, I can do that.

The notices tend to be sent out 14 days prior to the actual community meeting so that will give the community enough time to attend the meeting.

I'll send you a follow up email once the community meeting has been scheduled.

Peter Lange
Planner II - North Team
Land Use Review
City of Colorado Springs
Office: (719) 385-2229
Email: Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov

Links:

Planning & Community Development Home
Look at Applications Online (LDRS)
Pre-Application Meeting Request

☐☐ Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

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

From: Dave Murphy

Sent: Monday, July 10, 2023 8:27 AM

To: Lange, Peter C <Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: Re: Proposed mini storage development

Hi Peter,

I'm following up on the proposed self storage site on Old Ranch Road and Powers....anything new? I assume the developer has passed since our community never received a planning meeting letter from you.

Thanks,

Dave

Sent from my iPhone

bernsteinmurphy

5635 N. Scottsdale Road. Suite 170-121

Scottsdale, AZ 85250

Dave Murphy

602-625-9311

dave@bernsteinmurphy.com

www.bernsteinmurphy.com

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

From: Dave Murphy

Sent: Friday, July 11, 2025 3:34 PM

To: Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov

Subject: Re: Townes at Kettle Creek proposed storage facility

Hi Peter...it's Dave Murphy. Can you please call me at (602) 625-9311? Thx.

Sent from my iPhone

bernsteinmurphy

5635 N. Scottsdale Road. Suite 170-121

Scottsdale, AZ 85250

Dave Murphy

602-625-9311

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

From: Dave Murphy

Sent: Friday, July 14, 2023 7:14 AM

To: Peter.Lange@coloradosprings.gov

Subject: Re: Self Storage proposal

Hi Peter,

I tried connecting with you but haven't heard back. Did you move to a different department?

Dave

Sent from my iPhone

From: Dave Murphy dave@bernsteinmurphy.com
Subject: Re: Grok re-zoning
Date: July 14, 2025 at 8:18 PM
To: jennifer murphy jenny71@icloud.com
Cc: Dave Murphy dave@bernsteinmurphy.com



In Colorado Springs, rezoning a property from PBC (Planned Business Center) to MX-M (Mixed-Use Medium Scale) is subject to the procedures outlined in the Unified Development Code (UDC), specifically in Section 7.5.5 (Rezoning and Initial Zonings). Here's a concise breakdown regarding neighborhood involvement, notice, and approval requirements:

- **Neighborhood Involvement and Notice:**
 - **Public Notice Required:** Yes, rezoning to MX-M requires public notification. According to UDC Section 7.5.502, notice must be provided to surrounding property owners within a specified radius (typically 1,000 feet, per UDC Section 7.5.707). This includes:
 - **Mailed Notice:** Sent to property owners within the notification area at least 14 days before the public hearing.
 - **Posted Notice:** A sign must be posted on the property at least 14 days prior to the hearing, visible from public rights-of-way.
 - **Published Notice:** A legal notice must be published in a newspaper of general circulation at least 14 days before the hearing.
 - **Neighborhood Meeting:** While not always mandatory, a pre-application neighborhood meeting is strongly encouraged or may be required by the City Planner, especially if the rezoning is likely to generate significant community interest or impact (UDC Section 7.5.501). This provides an opportunity for neighborhood input before the formal application is submitted.
- **Approval Process:**
 - **Planning Commission Review:** The rezoning application is reviewed by the City Planning Commission during a public hearing, where neighborhood residents and stakeholders can provide comments.
 - **City Council Approval:** Final approval for a rezoning to MX-M requires a City Council decision, also through a public hearing. The Council considers the Planning Commission's recommendation, public input, and whether the rezoning aligns with the City's Comprehensive Plan and zoning criteria (UDC Section 7.5.503).
 - **No Direct Neighborhood Approval:** While neighborhood input is considered, formal approval from neighboring property owners or residents is not required. The decision rests with the City Council, based on compliance with zoning regulations and public welfare considerations.
- **Additional Considerations:**
 - If the MX-M rezoning includes a Land Use Plan (required in some cases per UDC Section 7.4.202), additional scrutiny may apply to ensure compatibility with surrounding areas, potentially increasing neighborhood interest.
 - The transition from PBC (which typically supports commercial and office uses) to MX-M (which allows a broader mix, including multi-family residential) may raise concerns about density, traffic, or land use compatibility, prompting more robust public engagement.

For a definitive answer specific to a property, contact the City Planning Department at 719-385-5905 or LURPlanningInfo@coloradosprings.gov to confirm requirements, as procedural details can vary based on the project's scope or location. A Pre-Application Meeting with a planner is recommended to clarify whether a neighborhood meeting is mandated and to review the specific notification process. Always verify with the UDC or City staff, as regulations may have been updated.

Disclaimer: Grok is not a lawyer; please consult one. Don't share information that can identify you.


The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

<u>Michael Wilhelm</u>	<u></u>	<u>19 Jul 2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Sara Wilhelm</u>	<u></u>	<u>19 JULY 2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Matt Monship</u>	<u></u>	<u>19 July 2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Becky Wright</u>	<u></u>	<u>19/7/2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>David Wright</u>	<u></u>	<u>19/7/2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Craig Myers</u>	<u></u>	<u>19 Jul 2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Stephanie Myers</u>	<u></u>	<u>19 Jul 2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Adonahinn</u>	<u></u>	<u>19/7/2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>MICHAEL Linn</u>	<u></u>	<u>19/7/2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Clifton Black</u>	<u></u>	<u>19/7/2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Adam Greer</u>	<u></u>	<u>19/7/2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Tyler Quist
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7-19-25
Date

Kaitlin Quist
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7-19-25
Date

Mary Spencer
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7-19-25
Date

Clinton Spencer
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7-19-25
Date

Logan Spencer
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7/19/25
Date

D. Michelle Johnson
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7/19/25
Date

[Signature]
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Vicky Banks
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Mary Banks
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Allen Arnold
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Kellye Arnold
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7-19-25
Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Courtney Pendleton
Printed Name

Courtney Pendleton
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Elizabeth Pendleton
Printed Name

Elizabeth Pendleton
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Debra Pendleton
Printed Name

Debra Pendleton
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Glenn Pennington
Printed Name

Glenn Pennington
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Mike Burks
Printed Name

Mike Burks
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Elizabeth Rowland
Printed Name

Elizabeth Rowland
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Clay Rowland
Printed Name

Clay Rowland
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Joseph Carter
Printed Name

Joseph Carter
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Lindsey Carter
Printed Name

Lindsey Carter
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Michael Esposito
Printed Name

Michael Esposito
Signature

7/19/25
Date

Stephanie Beaudette
Printed Name

Stephanie Beaudette
Signature

7/19/25
Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

JULIE C PRICE
Printed Name

Julie C Price
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Lance Newell
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

MARY JANE NEWELL
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

JEFF KEENER
Printed Name

Jeff Keener
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Carmen Maldonado
Printed Name

Carmen Maldonado
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Steve Maldonado
Printed Name

Steve Maldonado
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Michelle King
Printed Name

Michelle King
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

TONY FIEDLER
Printed Name

[Signature]
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Alyssa Downs
Printed Name

Alyssa Downs
Signature

7/18/25
Date

Vickie Keene
Printed Name

Vickie Keene
Signature

7/18/25
Date

William Keene
Printed Name

William Keene
Signature

7/18/25
Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

James Groce
Printed Name

James Groce
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Heather Sonnenberg
Printed Name

Heather Sonnenberg
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Tony SERAFINO
Printed Name

Tony Serafino
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Amanda Wilson
Printed Name

A. Wilson
Signature

7/18/25
Date

Carole O. Lujan
Printed Name

Carole O. Lujan
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Johnny Lujan
Printed Name

Johnny Lujan
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Francisco Figueroa
Printed Name

Franco
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Luz Figueroa
Printed Name

Luz Figueroa
Signature

7/18/2025
Date

Rod Sanders
Printed Name

Rod Sanders
Signature

7/18/25
Date

Rob Stein
Printed Name

R Stein
Signature

7/18/25
Date

GENE BROOKS
Printed Name

Gene Brooks
Signature

7/18/25
Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

William Thomas Fierro

Printed Name

William Thomas Fierro

Signature

19 Jul 2025

Date

Megan Ann Fierro

Printed Name

Megan Ann Fierro

Signature

7/19/25

Date

Rebecca Lyon

Printed Name

Rebecca Lyon

Signature

7/19/25

Date

Lauren Vega

Printed Name

Lauren Vega

Signature

7/19/25

Date

BEATRICE GIRARD

Printed Name

[Signature]

Signature

7/20/25

Date

Leonard Breuout

Printed Name

[Signature]

Signature

7/20/25

Date

Van Durrell

Printed Name

[Signature]

Signature

7/20/25

Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Linden Kinkead

Printed Name



Signature

7/19/2025

Date

LOUISE BAKER

Printed Name



Signature

7-19-25

Date

Carol Baker

Printed Name



Signature

- 7-19-25

Date

Grady Timmerman



Printed Name



Signature

7-19-25

Date

Angela Ostrow

Printed Name



Signature

07/19/2025

Date

Kira Schubert

Printed Name



Signature

7/19/2025

Date

Rico Perez

Printed Name



Signature

07/19/2025

Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Jack R Shultz Jack R Shultz 7/19/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Robert Steinke Robert Steinke 7/19/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Marie LN Burley Marie LN Burley 7/19/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Boye B Burley Boye B. Birley 7/19/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Brenda Umptress Brenda Umptress 7/19/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Ram Martin Ram Martin 7/19/25
Printed Name Signature Date

WAYNE HEFTYE Wayne Heftye 7/19/25
Printed Name Signature Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Kaye Long Printed Name Kaye Long Signature 7/19/25 Date

John Douglas Barnes Printed Name John Doug Barnes Signature 7/19/25 Date

Sandra K. Barnes Printed Name Sandra K. Barnes Signature 7/19/25 Date

Rick Dalechek Printed Name Rick Dalechek Signature 7/19/25 Date

Kathryn Dalechek Printed Name Kathryn Dalechek Signature 7/19/25 Date

Carol L. Morris Printed Name Carol L. Morris Signature 7/19/25 Date

Ronald F. Morris Printed Name Ronald F. Morris Signature 7-19-25 Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

<u>LISA DIAS</u>	<u></u>	<u>7-19-25</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>MICHAEL OLBERG</u>	<u></u>	<u>7.19.25</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Kenneth Balt</u>	<u></u>	<u>7.19.2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Rhonda K Martin</u>	<u></u>	<u>7-19-2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>David B. Meek</u>	<u></u>	<u>7-19-2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Tonni Richey</u>	<u></u>	<u>7-19-2025</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

<u>Chris Richey</u>	<u></u>	<u>7-19-25</u>
Printed Name	Signature	Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

John A. Thomas [Signature] 19 JULY 2025
Printed Name Signature Date

Susan R. Gartung [Signature] 19 July 2025
Printed Name Signature Date

Tikiwa Durrell [Signature] 19 Jul 2025
Printed Name Signature Date

RECEINACIA, HINNANT [Signature] 19 JULY 2025
Printed Name Signature Date

KASSANDRA. HINNANT [Signature] 19 JULY 2025
Printed Name Signature Date

Greg Wright [Signature] 19 JULY 2025
Printed Name Signature Date

Amy Turner [Signature] 19, July 2025
Printed Name Signature Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Dana Goodman Dana Goodman 7/18/2025
Printed Name Signature Date

Max Inacio [Signature] 7/18/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Kevin Lyon K. L 7/19/2025
Printed Name Signature Date

JENNIFER MURPHY [Signature] 7/19/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Keri Bobbitt [Signature] 7-19-25
Printed Name Signature Date

Vicky Boudreau Vicky Boudreau 7-19-25
Printed Name Signature Date

Rob Boudreau [Signature] 7-19-25
Printed Name Signature Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Bruce Fealey
Printed Name


Signature

7/20/25
Date

Thomas Aisl
Printed Name


Signature

7/20/25
Date

Kameron Lindsay
Printed Name


Signature

7/29/25
Date

Blongshia Lindsey
Printed Name


Signature


7/19/25
Date

MICHAEL LERICKS
Printed Name


Signature

7/19/25
Date

Stacey Kasten
Printed Name


Signature

7-19-25
Date

DAVE MURPHY
Printed Name


Signature

7-19-25
Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Rich White [Signature] 7-20-25
Printed Name Signature Date

Brenda White Brenda White 7/20/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Cory Andrews [Signature] 7/20/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Nichole Andrews [Signature] 7/20/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Beth Courrae Beth E. Courrae 7-20-25
Printed Name Signature Date

MARK A Gonzales Mark A Gonzales 7-20-25
Printed Name Signature Date

Cornelius W. Baugard Cornelius W. Baugard 7-20-25
Printed Name Signature Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

JOHNNY WARD
Printed Name


Signature

7-20-25
Date

Jamie Thompson
Printed Name


Signature

7-20-25
Date

Zachary Thompson
Printed Name


Signature

7-20-25
Date

SCOTT LINGER
Printed Name


Signature

7/20/25
Date

Katherine Linger
Printed Name


Signature

07/20/25
Date

Amanda Andrews
Printed Name


Signature

7/20/25
Date

AZAN ANDREWS
Printed Name


Signature


7/20/2025
Date


The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Dorissa Janas  7/20/2025
Printed Name Signature Date

MARLIN JANAS  7/20/2025
Printed Name Signature Date

MARGARET JANAS  7/20/2025
Printed Name Signature Date

Santieta Walter  20 Jul 25
Printed Name Signature Date

Gilroy Walter  20 Jul/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Stephen Bacon  7/20/25
Printed Name Signature Date

Debbie LANEY  7/20/25
Printed Name Signature Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Vanessa L. Chapel
Printed Name

Vanessa L. Chapel
Signature

7/20/25
Date

Achille Aloisi
Printed Name

Achille Aloisi
Signature

7/20/25
Date

Batina Aloisi
Printed Name

Batina Aloisi
Signature

7/20/25
Date

Andrea Ferguson
Printed Name

Andrea Ferguson
Signature

7-20-25
Date

Karen Marr
Printed Name

Karen Marr
Signature

7-20-25
Date

Bruce Marr
Printed Name

Bruce Marr
Signature

7/20/25
Date

Pracy N Cole
Printed Name


Pracy N Cole
Signature

7/20/25
Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Michael Corl

Printed Name



Signature

7/20/2025

Date

Jillian Corl

Printed Name



Signature

7/20/2025

Date

Ann-Noel Spencer

Printed Name



Signature

7/20/25

Date

Carlan Harps

Printed Name



Signature

7/20/25

Date



Printed Name



Signature

7/20/25

Date

SCOTT Hyskell

Printed Name



Signature

7/20/25

Date

Katie Hyskell

Printed Name



Signature

7/20/25

Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Nicole Robinson
Printed Name

Nicole Robin
Signature

7-20-25
Date

Grant Vojen
Printed Name

Grant Vojen
Signature

7-20-25
Date

Michael S. Oefjen
Printed Name

Michael S. Oefjen
Signature

7-20-25
Date

Jessika Doornbos
Printed Name

Jessika Doornbos
Signature

7-20-25
Date

Ted Dibble
Printed Name

Ted Dibble
Signature

7/20/25
Date

Kesin Pres
Printed Name

Kesin Pres
Signature

7/20/25
Date

Nick Chapal
Printed Name

Nick Chapal
Signature

7-20-25
Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Tom H. Robinson

Printed Name




Signature

07/20/25

Date

Jeannette Mitchell

Printed Name



Signature

07/20/25

Date

James Girard

Printed Name



Signature

7/20/25

Date

Megan Long

Printed Name



Signature

7/20/25

Date

James Acty

Printed Name

James Acty

Signature

7/20/25

Date

Kim Acty

Printed Name

Kim Acty

Signature

7/20/25

Date

Hailey Betancourt

Printed Name



Signature

7/20/2025

Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Craig Valentine
Printed Name


Signature

7-20-25
Date

Cynthia Valentine
Printed Name


Signature

7-29-25
Date

CRIS CLARK
Printed Name


Signature

7-19-25
Date

JULIE CLARK
Printed Name


Signature


7-19-25
Date

WAYNE LO
Wayne Lo
Printed Name


Signature

7-19-25
Date

JASON LANDRESS
Printed Name


Signature

7/19/25
Date

Emily Landress
Printed Name


Signature

7-19-25
Date

Printed Name

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Signature

Date

The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.

Michael Scabs

Printed Name



Signature

7-19-2025

Date

Ellen Scates

Printed Name

Ellen Scates

Signature

7/19/25

Date

Scott Johnson

Printed Name



Signature

7/19/25

Date

Ben George

Printed Name



Signature

7/19/25

Date

Kelly George

Printed Name

Kelly C George

Signature

7/19/25

Date

Adriane Nau

Printed Name

Adriane Nau

Signature

7/19/25

Date

Jamie Nau

Printed Name

Jamie Nau

Signature

7/19/25

Date

Printed Name

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Signature

Date

Printed Name

Signature

Date


The signatures below represent support for the attached Appeal to DEPN-
22-0021: Old Ranch Storage Facility.


Kevin Garlock - 19 July 2025 10644 Rhinestone

Printed Name Signature Date


Emily Garlock - 19 July 2025

Printed Name Signature Date


Allan Grimes 19 July 2025 - 3138 Summer Rain Trail

Printed Name Signature Date


Elizabeth A. Roper 19 Jul 25 - 3139 Summer Rain Trail

Printed Name Signature Date

Ann Claudia 
Marc Claudia 
3102 Summer Rain Trl

Printed Name Signature Date

NATHANIEL EARLY 
3103 Summer Rain Trl

Printed Name Signature Date

Susannah Early SC Early 7/19/2025
3103 Summer Rain Trl

Printed Name Signature Date

Printed Name Signature Date

Printed Name Signature Date

Printed Name	Signature	Date
PUNZA Brooks	Punza Brooks	7/18/25
Mark Korum	Mark Korum	7/18/25
Sharon L. Thomas	SHARON L. THOMAS	7/18/25
Dawn N. Smith	Dawn N. Smith	7/18/2025
ALEXANDER T. CRAIG	A. Craig	7/18/2025
Susan Brooks	Susan E. Brooks	7/18/25
FORREST BROOKS		7/18/25
Terra Sumstine		7-19-25
Chris Sumstine		7/19/25

James M Lobban		7-20-25
Printed Name	Signature	Date
Robin Lobban		7-20-25
Printed Name	Signature	Date
David Goffredi		7-20-25
Printed Name	Signature	Date
Pamela Goffredi		7/20/25
Printed Name	Signature	Date
Robin Lobban		7-20-25
Printed Name	Signature	Date
Ragaine Barsoom		7/20/25
Printed Name	Signature	Date
Sammie Barsoom		7/20/25
Printed Name	Signature	Date
James Kinsman		7/20/2025
Printed Name	Signature	Date
Charlotte Kinsman		7/20/2025
Printed Name	Signature	Date
WILLIAM SANI		7/20/2025
Printed Name	Signature	Date
Printed Name	Signature	Date