

## Sexton, Daniel

---

**From:** M Herjeczki <2911jetski@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 24, 2022 9:53 AM  
**To:** Sexton, Daniel  
**Subject:** Freestyle North

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 live in the Willow Wind sub division near Marksheffel. I am not against this development as long as Marksheffel is expanded to 2 lanes on each side from carefree to Dublin with appropriate turn lanes and access lanes and a median. There is too much traffic now and more development will make it more dangerous. Marksheffel moves military traffic north and south. It would also carry traffic out of these developments in case of a grass fire and emergency vehicles into them. Right now Marksheffel is one lane each way. Winter driving and head on accidents are very possible with no median and one lane on each side.

Thank you for hearing my concerns  
Margaret Herjeczki  
Sent from my iPhone

## Sexton, Daniel

---

**From:** Torris Keilers <tor@lwalandsurveying.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 21, 2022 8:38 AM  
**To:** Sexton, Daniel  
**Subject:** Freestyle North

**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,

I live at 5553 Tamlin Rd and I have some concerns about the new proposed development.

First it will be a very sad thing to lose the natural space, for not only losing the Pronghorn habitat which they use year round but also for our quietness.

That leads me to the second concern, the noise of the proposed Stetson Hills Road extension. Our house was built fairly close to our south property line.

It appears that the road will be very close to the common line. I am hoping that some sort of sound fence/wall can be designed to help with the road noise.

Also another issue is how the residents of the rest of our neighborhood will access off of Stetson Hills. I, as well as a number of other residents have a semi

with a long trailer. I am hoping there are plans for larger access points. ie. If there are planned round-a-bouts that the design will allow for tractor trailer ease of use.

Thanks for your time, I would like to hear about your thoughts.

Torris Keilers  
719-491-2959

## Sexton, Daniel

---

**From:** Robi Biderman <robi.biderman@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 19, 2022 10:13 AM  
**To:** Sexton, Daniel  
**Subject:** Sound barriers by Marksheffel Rd.

**CAUTION! - External Email. Malware is most commonly spread through unknown email attachments and links. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email!**

Dear Mr. Sexton,

We received the letter in regards to the new development east of Marksheffel between Stetson Hills and Barnes (CPC MP 87-00381-A30MJ22). It's great to see expansions and it's exciting to see that this one includes some park area and ponds (of which I believe there is quite a lack of on the west side of Marksheffel).

The part that concerns us personally is the expansion of the Marksheffel road. Our house backs up to Marksheffel road between Stetson Hills and Barnes road and it's currently one lane in each direction. Still, when truckers drive by and use their air brakes the noise in our backyard is unbearable and we cannot even hold a normal conversation if we are trying to enjoy some time in our backyard.

In the proposed plan, the current one lane in each direction will be turned into 3 lanes in each direction. Obviously that would mean that the noise levels will even increase significantly. So we would like to know if there's any plans to install any better sound barriers to account for that or will we still be left with a plain wooden fence?

I really look forward to your response or if you're not the best person to answer this question, hopefully you can at least point me to someone, who would be.

Have a great day,  
Robert Biderman

## Sexton, Daniel

---

**From:** Frederic Herman <fherman@Inferential.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 13, 2022 7:22 PM  
**To:** Sexton, Daniel  
**Subject:** Freestyle North

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 Daniel--

I have attempted to reach you by phone and left a couple of voice message. Since I didn't reach you or hear from you, I am emailing you with a brief idea about what my concerns are for Freestyle North (project) as well as other concerns about transportation not necessarily about the project.

I have downloaded and reviewed the documents posted for the project. In particular, I have specific questions/concerns after reviewing the Traffic Impact Study report by Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc., the Preliminary Drainage Report by Classic Consulting, and the Geo-Hazard report by Entech Engineering, Inc.

I am the manager of Southwest Equity Associates, LLP which owns the 18.88 acre parcel on the SE corner of Marksheffel Rd. and Huber Rd., and am also the president of Tri-Lakes Development Corp. which owns the 5 acre parcel at the NW corner of Huber Rd. and Luther Road. Both parcels would be directly affected by the planned extension of Stetson Hills Blvd. along the current county road, Huber Rd. Both entities are therefore stakeholders of any direct or indirect impact of the project.

Among my concerns:

[1] The transportation report indicates that the project will at least initially use Barnes Road as a major access to the project, and not use an extended Stetson Hills blvd. access. This seems odd in that the Banning Lewis Ranch (BLR) already has a segment in the west portion of the development, and even shows a segment west of control point 7 (Figure 8). Currently, there is no portion of Barnes Rd. east of Marksheffel Rd. Is the city going to allow the long delay of Stetson Hills Parkway and why?

[2] The Geo-Hazard report shows a re-alignment from the straight east-west run of the Stetson Hills Blvd. on Figure 3 on page 27. This figure presumably shows the extended Stetson Hills Blvd. first swinging south through the SEA property and the project and then returning to a straight east-west alignment approximately after it passes the Toy Ranches subdivision. Please be advised that SEA does not agree to this extra intrusion onto our property, but understands that the extended Stetson Hills Blvd will require possibly another 30 feet of R.O.W. from our parcel.

[3] The Preliminary Drainage Report uses a previous figure for the East Fork Sand Creek Drainage Basin Planning Study circa 1989. On this figure, there is a road, Bridlespur Rd., presumably the extended Stetson Hills Blvd. This road shows a straight east-west alignment until it enters the BLR. Why does the new alignment now show a deviation from the original east-west alignment?

Also on this figure, there is a road labeled as Stapleton Drive running through the project and extending north along the section line on the east side of Toy Ranches. Since all section lines have a automatic 60 foot R.O.W., 30 feet on each side of the section line, is this road part of the city transportation future plan or not? This is not a casual question. I am also

the manager of another partnership, IOTO Associates LLP which owns a parcel on the east side of La Costa Rd having its east side on the section line alluded to.

[4] The Transportation Impact Study does not address what will happen with the west termination of Tamlin Rd. at Marksheffel Rd. I have "heard" that the plan is to cul-de-sac Tamlin and not allow the road to connect to Marksheffel Rd. Why is this not addressed in the study, and what is the city transportation engineering's plan on this?

[5] I have found no information about the dedication of additional R.O.W. from the project for the widening of Marksheffel Rd. The Transportation Impact Study does show that Marksheffel Rd. will be a 6-lane divided road. However, there is no indication that I found that Marksheffel Rd. will be widened during the development of the project. I also was unable to find any dedication of R.O.W. for the project for the Marksheffel Rd. The widening is long overdue judging from the 1/2 mile long line of backup traffic during the rush hour.

While I have been a somewhat passive observer of what the city is planning regarding development and transportation in the area in the vicinity of the project, I must now insist that I be given access to ALL the city's transportation information for Marksheffel Rd., Stetson Hills Blvd. extension, and Tamlin Rd. in this vicinity. This access needs to be both from the city and the project's development contractors.

I might point out that SEA's parcel at Marksheffel Rd & Stetson Hills Blvd. was under contract last year. The buyer aborted the contract because they were close to the end of the inspection period, but could not get a definitive answer from the city about what R.O.W. would be taken for the adjacent roads. The consequence of losing the sale after owning the property for many decades is that the partnership incurred financial impact.

I am hoping that I will receive cooperation from the city in my request.

Thank you in advance for responding to this communication.

Frederic (Fred) Herman

## Sexton, Daniel

---

**From:** Paul Klahn <paulg.klahn@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 19, 2022 11:58 AM  
**To:** Sexton, Daniel  
**Subject:** Comments on Development Proposal

**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 know the proposed development along Marksheffel Rd. has been a long-term plan; I don't oppose the development in and of itself. I do have very serious concerns as to the traffic impact on Marksheffel Rd. and on the City's available water supply for this part of the city. Marksheffel Rd. today is already a "traffic jam" during morning and evening rush hour loads. I think Marksheffel Rd needs to be widened to three lanes in each direction as soon as the development starts. Regarding water supply, I can't remember what year the massive pipe was put in from Pueblo reservoir and connected to our City's water supply system; I am hearing that that system is already at or near maximum capacity. The increased population that this development will bring needs to have water supply considerations to go hand in hand with the development and avoid shortages for everyone in the surrounding area as well. Thank you for your consideration.

Paul Klahn  
4861 Sand Ripples Lane  
Colorado Springs, CO 80922

## Sexton, Daniel

---

**From:** Jim and Elisabeth Burnett <jandeburnett@skybeam.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 21, 2022 1:57 PM  
**To:** Sexton, Daniel  
**Subject:** Norwood CPC MP 87-00381-A30MJ22

**CAUTION! - External Email. Malware is most commonly spread through unknown email attachments and links. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email!**

Mr. Sexton

Although the development in this part of Colorado Springs is unstoppable, it needs to be done with the necessary infrastructure in place to allow a smooth integration of the increased demand this development will generate.

I have used Marksheffel as a primary commute route since August of 1981. Back in those days, three cars in an hour on Marksheffel was heavy traffic. Today it is a much different story.

The rapid development on both the east and west sides of Marksheffel between Platte Ave (Hwy 24) and the ongoing development north of Marksheffel and Woodmen Road has put an unsustainable increase in demand on the two lane portion of Marksheffel between North Carefree and Dublin. During rush hour I have often seen traffic backed up through this entire 2.75 mile section, and on days with traffic accidents it totally shuts down.

I have friends who tell me it is not uncommon to wait 10 minutes for a safe space to turn onto Marksheffel from Graphite Dr. or Zircon Dr. at the south end of this two lane stretch. At the north end, north of Dublin, there are only two roads, Dublin and Vista Cerro Ave, both of which empty onto Marksheffel. The development in this part of Banning Lewis Ranch is increasing as 300 more acres are being prepared for development at this time.

Now Norwood wants to add an additional 500 acre development. This will lead to a significant increase in infrastructure usage. Everywhere this development accesses Marksheffel Road, it is a two lane, and Marksheffel is already overwhelmed with traffic.

My first concern about this new development is how you are going to connect Huber Rd (future Stetson Hills Blvd?) to Luther Rd and Sayres Rd.

During rush hour the access to these roads will be very difficult and there are many large commercial trucks based on these roads, which travel them several times a day. I don't want the same problem to happen to the access to our neighborhood as our friends living off Marksheffel on Graphite and Zircon Drives.

Please require and put in place the necessary improvements in the roadway infrastructure **before** any additional housing areas are developed .

I think Banning Lewis Parkway (BLPW) should be completed from Woodmen south to the neighborhood south of Barnes Rd, Barnes Road should be extended east to BLPW and extra thought should be given to how Luther Rd and Sayres Rd are incorporated into Stetson Hills Blvd as it is extended eastward to BLPW. And most of all, Marksheffel needs to be a continuous 4-lane road from Dublin to North Carefree before any additional development is considered.

Jim Burnett  
6420 Luther rd  
719 331-9371  
[jandeburnett@skybeam.com](mailto:jandeburnett@skybeam.com)

Sent from my iPhone



## Sexton, Daniel

---

**From:** Honor Guard <honorguardcoe@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 10, 2022 11:43 AM  
**To:** Sexton, Daniel  
**Subject:** Freestyle North

**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!

I apologize for the tardiness of this note. Nevertheless, I would like to share some thoughts.

You have a challenging job and I speak from some experience. I had the privilege of serving on the Planning Commission of a suburban Chicago town some time ago. I realize how challenging it can be to successfully negotiate complicated waters.

I live in Eastview Estates. Quite frankly, I am strongly opposed to the proposed development known as Freestyle North. Single family homes are bad enough; particularly the way they're being crammed together as of late. Apartments and condos mixed with single family homes are totally inappropriate. Frankly, I am not particularly crazy about the multi family development that was placed at Stetson Hills and Antelope Ridge. I don't know where these ideas are coming from. Some textbook author (with little to no practical experience) must be teaching that putting single family homes and multi-family homes together in the same project is a great idea. It's not. These would be far better suited in their own areas much like the development on the southwest corner of Woodmen and Powers, north of Villasport. Multifamily dwellings need their own areas. Period.

While we're at it, one of the things that I've never been able to understand is why the city does not insist developers include road improvements at their expense as a condition of approval. Regardless of what happens with this new development, I think we could all agree that Tutt should have been widened. Quite frankly, my past experience on a Planning Commission was that we would consider not just the present needs but future ones based on purposed developments. We would therefore insist any significant development like the ones on Tutt or Mark Shefel include widening of the roads bordering the purposed area development as a condition of approval. The increased traffic would require this, not to mention the destruction of the current roads caused by the purposed construction. So why not have the developer do this instead of the city after the fact?

Tutt between Barnes and Constitution Avenue is a prime example of this. Hundreds of residents not to mention the rest of the population that frequently travels up and down Tutt are forced to deal with a two-lane road. There is no way that all of this development (hotels, apartments/condos, assisted living etc.) should have been approved without insisting the widening of Tutt. Now that the golf course is gone and 300+more homes are crwoding in it only makes things worse. This should never have been allowed to happen.

Again, I realize my comments are tardy and for that I apologize. I still appreciate this opportunity to share some thoughts with you and I sincerely hope they are given some serious consideration for the future.

Respectfully At Your Service,

G.F. Clark  
Colorado Springs