

Baxter, Tamara

From: Andrea Holzer <ahwoughter@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 9, 2025 10:29 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Objection Millers crossing 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!

Ms. Baxter

I was hoping you could pass on my concern and objections to the Millers Crossing Development to the developer of the proposal and city council.

The following issues are of great concern to myself and my neighbors:

1) the inspiration to put both points of access and exit within my neighborhood of Quail Brush Creek (QBC). While this idea may comply with the strictest interpretation of the law , it does not comply with with the intent of the law which is to allow safe evacuation and access by emergency vehicles of and to a neighborhood. I feel that this will be adding a bottle neck within a bottle neck and will impede safe evacuation of QBC as well as the residents of the proposed Millers Crossing development. About two years ago there was a fire at one of the landscapers off QBC Drive- which closed that road for several hours, and impeded traffic significantly as everyone had to use Gold Drop Drive to Flowering Almond Drive to come and go. This was not a mass evacuation event and did not involve an additional 385 plus vehicles (figuring 2.5 vehicles times the 154 proposed units).

2) the city is not even aware of being responsible for the roads within QBC, and said roads are dangerous, already degrading, not properly signed and not patrolled . Among other things , we have a significant speeding issue here as this neighborhood serves as a thoroughfare from Woodmen Road to Dublin Drive. It is not uncommon for traffic to proceed at 45-60 MPH here, significantly endangering our residents , especially our children and those needing assistance walking.

I recently asked the city to investigate adding speed limit signs, flashing light, speed bumps and particularly investigate the pitch and degree of bend of Thornbrush Lane, as that road is a significant hazard and we have had many accidents there especially in in-climate weather. I'd say we average 10 accidents in that curve every winterseason. My request for services was denied as I was informed the road is still partially owned by the builder. I did contact the metro district about this and they claim that the road has been transferred to the city.

In any case until this issue is cleared up and the city maintains this road, adds the additional safety measures and signage and regularly patrols for speeders and repairs the roads , I can not advocate for adding more traffic to a seriously dangerous set of roads.

3) as you know we are in a Metro district- special taxation which adds significant additional tax burden (about 45 % additional taxes) to the 236 homeowners of QBC. We have bond measures in effect for up to 20 more years , and these extra taxes were levied to build these roads - which as mentioned are already not being maintained. I for my share do not consent to another developments residents and the heavy construction equipment to degrade my extra tax burden without some settlement of our debt. These roads were and are financed by QBC residents and it is simply not fair for us to pay for something for the residents of Millers Crossing to use without partaking in the settlement of our bonds.

Additionally so many things here in QBC were overlooked when the builder left this development and the residents here had to pay taxes to two fire departments for 6 plus years for some residents, until yours truly

worked with former councilman Pico to eventually alleviate that burden. Point being there appear to be many issues in this development that were not properly handled and it is foolish to add more possible legal hoops to go through by adding yet another development to a poorly managed development.

In summary I request the following:

- 1) No annexation of Millers Crossing land until roads to the east can also be accessed to secure entry and exit into Millers Crossing. Having the development access the only points of entry and exit through QBC endangers both communities in cases of emergency, especially a mass evacuation event. Furthermore trying to get large emergency vehicles into this proposed circle of roads within already established circle of roads is not ideal at best.
- 2) clarification of who owns these roads and immediate maintenance and improved signage, and patrolling of these roads.
- 3) a traffic study of these roads, especially in in-climate weather. Additionally monitoring of speeds and enforcement of speed limits is needed.
- 4) no addition of Millers Crossing via QBC until the financial matters pertaining to the additional taxes levied through bond measures can be settled.
- 5) a serious look by city planning at the mess up on Woodmen Road. I have been a resident here for 8 years, and every year for the last 5 years the city tears up Woodmen Road to add another turn lane for all the developments that were added years ago. Point is there will be a point down the road where the city will realize that some other access to Millers Crossing is needed- so let's plan it properly from the beginning.

Sincerely Andrea Holzer

QBC resident.

Sent from my iPhone

Baxter, Tamara

From: ryan_o12@comcast.net
Sent: Tuesday, June 3, 2025 8:00 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Concerns with Miller-Downs at Wyoming Lane 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 evening Tamara,

I'm writing to you today after signs were posted in my neighborhood of Quail Brush Creek on Cat Tail Creek Dr regarding a planned development right behind my house that is being called Miller-Downs at Wyoming Lane. I understand you are the case planner for this proposal and would like to express my utmost concerns with this nearsighted and poorly thought out proposal. I am vehemently opposed to this development being created.

My wife and I have lived in our home on Cat Tail Creek Dr for less than a year now. One of the major drawing attractions of the home was the large, beautiful open space behind the home which beyond offering fantastic views of nature also ensured us peace and quiet in our own home. We came from a horrible area in town off Galley and Murray that was loud, obnoxious, and miserable full of terrible neighbors and were so pleasantly surprised as we were house shopping to find a home that didn't even have a neighbor behind it. This has allowed us to live in more comfort and happiness and the fact that some corrupt, greedy developer is seeking to take away one of the major attractions of our home purchase is as infuriating as it is demoralizing. I fear for the dramatic plummet our quality of life will take alongside our property value once this encroachment of a development is built up. Not to mention the absolute unreasonable disturbance the entire construction phase will cause for months on end. I work from home and my wife works night shifts in a hospital and we will both be beyond miserable both while construction is ongoing and long after once people move in to these structures. I'm sure we're not the only people in the area that feel this way, both on the Quail Brush Creek side of the open space as well as on the opposite side for the residents on Mustang Rim Dr.

Beyond noise, unsightly buildings, and additional neighbors of questionable quality, this development would also pose a massive burden to the currently existing infrastructure, especially the road infrastructure which will be unable to sustain the additional flow of vehicles in the immediate area. If you've ever traveled to this part of town, you know that the major roadways nearby such as Woodmen, Dublin, and Marksheffel are already maxed out to their reasonable capacity and traffic is an absolute disaster at any time of day or night except for around 2am. There is no remedy for this already existing problem, but the issue can and will absolutely be exacerbated by the addition of Miller-Downs.

Adventure Way, which from looking at the maps appears to be the only way in or out of this proposed area, is a single lane roadway each direction with steep, winding hills, necessitating slow moving traffic. There are hardly any traffic control devices beyond the occasional stop sign, and it's already painful enough trying to come or go from Quail Brush Creek out to Woodmen via Adventure Way, especially on a Sunday with the massive influx of traffic from the local church. Should any type of major disaster occur, be it flooding, fire, or an active shooter, no one will be able to get out of Miller-Downs or Quail Brush Creek. That's of course a worst-case scenario, but one can only imagine the misery that will be daily comings and goings in or out of either area, especially when the inevitable car crashes occur and law enforcement begin closing lanes or entire roadways and attempting to divert traffic.

I find the fact that this development is even being considered unacceptable. I'd strongly urge you to reconsider ever allowing this development to exist. It will disrupt and ruin every single resident's quality of life that already lives here as well as those who would be moving in to the new development. I know it's not much of a consequence for the city or anyone else, but unfortunately if this project is allowed to proceed I'll have no choice but to sell and move elsewhere. I can't imagine I'm the only one currently considering that possibility.

For everyone's sake, please do the right thing, Tamara. End this project before it even begins. Thank you for your time and consideration. Please feel free to reach out to me at any time with any additional questions or concerns you may have. Take care!

-Ryan R. Oettinger
7458 Cat Tail Creek Dr
Colorado Springs, CO 80923
719-210-4295

Baxter, Tamara

From: Cathia Bell <cathiabellqbc@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 3, 2025 11:42 AM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Miller Downs project

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 Tamara,
I am a concerned resident of Quail Brush Creek and the president of the HOA board here.

We are very concerned about the proposed Miller Downs project behind our neighborhood, primarily because that parcel on Wyoming Lane is locked in with no direct exits, and the residents of Miller Downs will have no access to Woodmen Road and Dublin Blvd. except through Quail Brush Creek.

We already have traffic congestion in this neighborhood and our streets are narrow.
We have deep concerns that if a disaster strikes or a widespread fire occurs, that the residents of our neighborhood may not be able to vacate quickly and safely.

At one time, I believe the City was planning to annex the private roads surrounding the Wyoming Lane parcel, such as Wyoming Lane, Utah Lane, Nevada Lane, and California Dr. If that were to occur, then it would make the new neighborhood much more feasible and acceptable.

Past traffic studies to build on that parcel were not thorough or accurate and with other recent new builds in the near vicinity, the traffic situation is even more problematic.

Thanks,

Cathia Bell
Quail Brush Creek
719-291-4676

Baxter, Tamara

From: Nicole Lee <nicole@ashfordrealtygroup.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2025 3:20 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Miller-Downs @ Wyoming Lane Annexation

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

To whom it may concern:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed housing project in our area. My concerns stem from two primary issues: the potential decrease in surrounding property values and the negative impact on local wildlife.

The introduction of a large-scale housing project could significantly alter the character of our neighborhood. Increased density and the associated infrastructure changes may lead to a decline in property values for existing homeowners. Studies have shown that such developments can sometimes strain local resources and services, further contributing to a decrease in desirability and, consequently, property values. Those of us who currently live in this area, are already experiencing a decrease in property values due to the last couple years of heavy developments of housing in this area. Not to mention when we built our homes, we were told this specific area could not be developed due to it being a flood zone. The city already does not take care of the Sand Creek located within this area, so I am not sure how the city would propose being able to do so with even more development. Our property taxes continue to rise, while home values decrease, and both are a direct issue with the previous approved developments between the Woodmen and Dublin areas. The infrastructure is already overwhelmed, and even with the current improvements, it won't solve the issue for the residents by adding an additional 126 homes to an area already overloaded. We are already one of the highest taxed areas, and this will only increase as the school district will have to find a way to house even more students, driving up property taxes even more.

Additionally, this area is home to diverse wildlife. (coyotes, deer, woodpeckers, eagles, elk, and more)The proposed construction would inevitably disrupt natural habitats, leading to displacement and potential harm to local species. Clearing land, increased traffic, and noise pollution are just a few of the factors that could severely affect the ecosystem. It is crucial to consider the environmental consequences and prioritize the preservation of our area's natural beauty and wildlife. With the developments that were approved by the city without input from the community, has already made a significant decline in the natural environment we used to have. This area is already overwhelmed by road noise and even the wildlife habitats that used to be more open, has forced them into a more dense area and into the current neighboring housing developments.

I urge you to carefully reconsider this project and explore alternative solutions that better balance development with the preservation of our community's value and natural environment.

Thank you,

Nicole Lee

Realtor/Broker Owner

AshfordRealtyGroup.com



o: 719.574.2227 Ext 901 | f: 888.631.0062

1755 Telstar Dr. #300 Colorado Springs, CO 80920



Baxter, Tamara

From: Cami Beck <cami@creationsbycami.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 15, 2025 10:21 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Miller-Downs at Wyoming Lane Annexation, Zone Establishment, Land Use Plan

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

Dear Ms. Baxter, Colorado Springs City Council and Community Stakeholders:

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed annexation of the 21.37-acre Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1. This proposal, which seeks to add 5-7 dwellings per acre near a creek, raises significant concerns for the city and the surrounding community. The main issues—insufficient road infrastructure, and risks to the adjacent creek from construction runoff—make this annexation not in the best interests of Colorado Springs. Road Infrastructure is Inadequate The current road network in the area is not equipped to handle the increased traffic that would result from adding over 100 new homes. Past regional transportation plans have shown that Colorado Springs faces ongoing challenges in keeping up with road expansions and upgrades to match new developments. Without substantial improvements, this annexation will worsen congestion, increase commute times, and strain emergency response capabilities. These issues were already factors when the annexation was previously denied, and no significant changes have been made to address them. The neighborhood to the west currently has 153 lots spread over approximately 58 acres. This new annexation is up to 150 lots over less than half the amount of land (21 acres). This density is absolutely insane. The annexation is not near any metro stops and I find it hard to believe the one road into it will be able to support 300 cars daily (@ 2 cars per dwelling). These cars will be traversing through an existing neighborhood that wasn't built for this amount of traffic.

Runoff and Creek Health Risks Construction on previously undeveloped land near a creek poses serious risks for stormwater runoff and erosion. Even with city and state stormwater controls, the initial phases of development are when the greatest risk occurs: disturbed soil washes into streets, sewers, and ultimately into local waterways. If not managed perfectly, this runoff can degrade water quality, harm aquatic habitats, and increase flood risks for downstream residents. The city has seen firsthand the costly and damaging effects of inadequate stormwater management in other urbanized watersheds, such as North Douglas Creek, where channel degradation and infrastructure failures resulted in millions of dollars in repairs and environmental harm. There is no evidence that the current annexation plan has addressed these risks any better than before. The density of the housing actually looks worse than before. No Substantial Change from the Previous Proposal This annexation was already turned down once, and as far as can be determined, nothing material has changed in the proposal to address the core concerns. The city's annexation process rightly requires not just procedural compliance but also a substantive review of whether such growth is in the best interest of the community. Given the ongoing deficiencies in infrastructure, water supply, and environmental protection, this proposal does not meet that standard. Utility Costs Not Factored In I don't see financial implications factored in, on the website.

<https://coloradosprings.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7375832&GUID=2DFDB6CD-8FA9-41AA-9799-0A0D063AA26C&Options=&Search=&FullText=1> Colorado Springs residents are often concerned about who bears the true costs of utility expansion when new developments are annexed. While city code and utility policies state that developers are required to pay for the design, installation, and construction of all necessary electric, gas, water, wastewater, and stormwater systems to serve their developments, the reality is more complex.

Recent large-scale annexations, such as the Karman Line and Amara projects, have shown that even when developers are responsible for on-site infrastructure, the costs of extending major utility systems—especially off-site or regional upgrades—are frequently financed by Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) using funds collected from all ratepayers. These costs can be substantial; for example, the East Wastewater System Expansion project was nearly \$400 million, with CSU planning to recoup the costs over time through recovery fees and higher utility rates for all customers. In some cases, this has led to average utility bills increasing by hundreds of dollars per year for local families. Furthermore, while recent policy changes require developers to pay 100% of the direct costs for electric and natural gas line extensions starting in 2025, customers still share in the burden for broader system expansions and upgrades through base rates and additional fees. This means that even if the proposed development does not list explicit costs, residents will likely bear some of the financial responsibility for expanding and maintaining the city's utility infrastructure to accommodate new growth. Despite official requirements that developers pay for utility extensions, Colorado Springs residents frequently end up shouldering significant costs for major utility expansions through increased rates and fees. Conclusion Colorado Springs must prioritize responsible, sustainable growth that does not outpace its infrastructure or natural resources. Approving the Miller Downs annexation as currently proposed would undermine those priorities and set a troubling precedent for future development. While development in this area is unavoidable, the density should at least make sense. We urge the City Council to reject this annexation and instead focus on solutions that protect our roads, water, and environment for current and future residents. Sources Hyperlinked for ease.

<https://pikespeakhabitat.org/handling-storm-water-at-the-build-site/>
https://www.codot.gov/programs/planning/assets/plans-projects-reports/Previous-Plans/2035-regional-plans/ppacg/all_ppacg_appendices.pdf Respectfully,

Camilla and Michael Beck
7024 Dancing Wind Dr.
Colorado Springs, CO 80923

Baxter, Tamara

From: John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2025 9:26 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Cc: John Tompkins
Subject: Statement Opposing the Proposed Miller Downs Annexation

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 the Colorado Springs City Council and Community Stakeholders:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed annexation of the 21.37-acre Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1. This proposal, which seeks to add 5-7 dwellings per acre near a creek, raises significant concerns for the city and the surrounding community. The main issues—insufficient road infrastructure, and risks to the adjacent creek from construction runoff—make this annexation not in the best interests of Colorado Springs.

Road Infrastructure Is Inadequate

The current road network in the area is not equipped to handle the increased traffic that would result from adding over 100 new homes. Past regional transportation plans have shown that Colorado Springs faces ongoing challenges in keeping up with road expansions and upgrades to match new developments^[1]. Without substantial improvements, this annexation will worsen congestion, increase commute times, and strain emergency response capabilities. These issues were already factors when the annexation was previously denied, and no significant changes have been made to address them. The neighborhood to the west currently has 153 lots spread over approximately 58 acres. This new annexation is up to 150 lots over less than half the amount of land. (21 acres) This density is absolutely insane. The annexation is not near any metro stops and I find it hard to believe the one road into it will be able to support 300 cars daily. (@ 2 cars per dwelling). These cars will be traversing through an existing neighborhood that wasn't built for this amount of traffic.

Runoff and Creek Health Risks

Construction on previously undeveloped land near a creek poses serious risks for stormwater runoff and erosion. Even with city and state stormwater controls, the initial phases of development are when the greatest risk occurs: disturbed soil washes into streets, sewers, and ultimately into local waterways^[4]. If not managed perfectly, this runoff can degrade water quality, harm aquatic habitats, and increase flood risks for downstream residents. The city has seen firsthand the costly and damaging effects of inadequate stormwater management in other urbanized watersheds, such as North Douglas Creek, where channel degradation and infrastructure failures resulted in millions of dollars in repairs and environmental harm^[5]. There is no evidence that the current annexation plan has

addressed these risks any better than before. The density of the housing actually looks worse than before.

No Substantial Change from the Previous Proposal

This annexation was already turned down once, and as far as can be determined, nothing material has changed in the proposal to address the core concerns. The city's annexation process rightly requires not just procedural compliance but also a substantive review of whether such growth is in the best interest of the community. Given the ongoing deficiencies in infrastructure, water supply, and environmental protection, this proposal does not meet that standard.

Utility Costs Not Factored In?

I don't see financial implications factored in, on the website.

<https://coloradosprings.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7375832&GUID=2DFDB6CD-8FA9-41AA-9799-0A0D063AA26C&Options=&Search=&FullText=1>

Colorado Springs residents are often concerned about who bears the true costs of utility expansion when new developments are annexed. While city code and utility policies state that developers are required to pay for the design, installation, and construction of all necessary electric, gas, water, wastewater, and stormwater systems to serve their developments, the reality is more complex¹²³⁴.

Recent large-scale annexations, such as the Karman Line and Amara projects, have shown that even when developers are responsible for on-site infrastructure, the costs of extending major utility systems—especially off-site or regional upgrades—are frequently financed by Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) using funds collected from all ratepayers¹⁵⁶. These costs can be substantial; for example, the East Wastewater System Expansion project was nearly \$400 million, with CSU planning to recoup the costs over time through recovery fees and higher utility rates for all customers¹. In some cases, this has led to average utility bills increasing by hundreds of dollars per year for local families¹⁵.

Furthermore, while recent policy changes require developers to pay 100% of the direct costs for electric and natural gas line extensions starting in 2025, customers still share in the burden for broader system expansions and upgrades through base rates and additional fees⁴⁵. This means that even if the proposed development does not list explicit costs, residents will likely bear some of the financial responsibility for expanding and maintaining the city's utility infrastructure to accommodate new growth.

Despite official requirements that developers pay for utility extensions, Colorado Springs residents frequently end up shouldering significant costs for major utility expansions through increased rates and fees.¹⁵⁶

Conclusion

Colorado Springs must prioritize responsible, sustainable growth that does not outpace its infrastructure or natural resources. Approving the Miller Downs annexation as currently proposed would undermine those priorities and set a troubling precedent for future development. While development in this area is unavoidable, the density should at least make sense. I urge the City Council to reject this annexation and instead focus on solutions that protect our roads, water, and environment for current and future residents.

Sources Hyperlinked for ease.

<https://pikespeakhabitat.org/handling-storm-water-at-the-build-site/>

https://www.codot.gov/programs/planning/assets/plans-projects-reports/Previous-Plans/2035-regional-plans/ppacg/all_ppacg_appendices.pdf

Respectfully submitted,

John Tompkins

6716 Silver Star Ln. Colorado Springs, CO 80923

719-357-5843

Baxter, Tamara

From: Tammie Anderson <tammie_anderson@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2025 1:40 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Miller-Downs at Wyoming Lane Annexation - Apposed

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 Indigo Ranch, at Stetson Ridge and am opposed to this development.

We have lived here since 2020 and enjoy the peace and quiet our neighborhood affords us. We have 1 road out of our development, onto Dublin. This is a 2-lane road and traffic is already horrible. In the mornings and evenings, as all the home owners, from 4 neighborhoods try to get out of the neighborhood having to wait up to 10 minutes to access Dublin.

Water is already in short supply for the entire city. We have had rationing for watering our yards and trees for the past 4 years. With the addition of a development adding 154 units, adjacent to our property, I cannot even begin to imagine the problems with traffic on a road, Dublin, that was not meant for the current volume of traffic. We pay our taxes and utility bills which are supposed to improve roads and build parks to have itsy bitsy places where there is no housing.

Please do not go through with this project. This area is too built up on as it is. The police and fire departments cannot keep up with the growth all ready it is already stressed.

Thank you,
Tammie Anderson

Baxter, Tamara

From: Heather Bly <docrx@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2025 11:52 AM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Miller-Downs at Wyoming Lane Annexation

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!

Tamara,

We are writing in regards to the notification we received about the Miller-Downs Annexation, Anex-24-0016, Zone-25-0015, LUPL-25-0006.

Our concerns are:

1. How is the integrity of Sand Creek and the trail going to be maintained? Concern for both the wildlife and the aesthetics of the trail/creek.
2. Are the homes going to be comparable to adjacent homes, as to not bring down existing home values?
3. Is there a height limit for the homes being built, so the sight line of existing homes is not obstructed?
4. Will covenants/HOA be in place to maintain the homes/neighborhood?

Thank you for your time!

Sincerely,
Loy & Heather Bly
Indigo Ranch Homeowners

Baxter, Tamara

From: Roger Haywood <roger@accentlandscapesinc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2025 8:35 AM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Miller-Downs 7020 Wyoming Lane

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 Tamara,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments for the proposed development.

I have been in communication with the developers and have found them to be friendly and helpful.

I would like to reiterate my personal request that the new homes stay well off of my western property line in order to maintain the rural feel of my property. Also, if possible, please maintain a view corridor from my existing home that is positioned on the northern end of my 2 acre lot.

Thank you,

Roger Haywood

Cell 719.499.2226

Baxter, Tamara

From: Vincent Anderson <vincent.anderson@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2025 1:45 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Miller-Downs at Wyoming Lane Annexation - Opposed

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 Ms. Baxter,

I live in the Indigo Ranch, at Stetson Ridge and am opposed to this development.

We have lived here since 2020 and enjoy the peace and quiet our neighborhood affords us. We have 1 road out of our development, onto Dublin. This is a 2-lane road and traffic is already horrible. In the mornings and evenings, as all the home owners, from 4 neighborhoods try to get out of the neighborhood having to wait up to 10 minutes to access Dublin.

Water is already in short supply for the entire city. We have had rationing for watering our yards and trees for the past 4 years. With the addition of a development adding 154 units, adjacent to our property, I cannot even begin to imagine the problems with traffic on a road, Dublin, that was not meant for the current volume of traffic. We pay our taxes and utility bills which are supposed to improve roads and build parks to have itsy bity places where there is no housing.

Please do not go through with this project. This area is too built-up as it is. The police and fire departments cannot keep up with the growth all ready it is already stressed.

Thank you,
Vincent Anderson

vincent.anderson@hotmail.com

Baxter, Tamara

From: John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 1, 2025 8:21 AM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Re: Statement Opposing the Proposed Miller Downs Annexation

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!

Sorry, I just saw on the website that there were more documents to review. I'm still learning to maneuver the website. I also reviewed some of the public comments which allowed me to pull more relative data out of the LUP Records that were submitted.

Here are five strong reasons the city council should not approve the Miller Downs annexation at this time, focusing on inconsistencies, flaws, and misleading claims in the studies and public input response—especially regarding the traffic study and current construction impacts:

1. Traffic Study Results Are Invalid Due to Ongoing Construction

- The traffic study was conducted while Marksheffel Road is under major construction. Dublin won't be finished until late September, and Marksheffel for two more years. Any counts or projections taken now do not reflect real-world, post-construction traffic patterns, making the study's conclusions unreliable. Approving annexation based on these numbers would be premature and potentially harmful to future traffic operations. Black Forest and Woodmen intersections should absolutely be surveyed. Not sure why this was left out of the traffic study.

2. Traffic Study Underestimates Peak Hour Impacts

- The study claims 1,130 daily trips but only 79 AM and 100 PM peak hour trips—much lower than typical ratios for similar developments. This artificially minimizes the projected congestion and impact on local roads during rush hour, when residents will feel it most

3. Public Input Concerns Dismissed Without Addressing Flaws

- The developer's response letter repeatedly references the traffic study's "no impact" finding, but ignores the flawed methodology and timing. Public comments about safety, congestion, and neighborhood cut-through traffic are brushed aside, relying on a study that is both incomplete and misleading

4. Approval Would Ignore City's Own Review Process and Standards

1. Multiple city departments (traffic, stormwater, planning) have flagged required corrections, missing information, and the need for further coordination before approval. For example, the city's own comments require additional analysis of private access, geologic hazards, floodplain impacts, and streamside buffers. Approving the annexation now would be contrary to the city's own review standards and best practices. I apologize if I missed this document somewhere.

In summary:

- No valid traffic study can be completed until Dublin and Marksheffel construction is finished and normal traffic patterns return.
- The current study's numbers are inconsistent and misleading, especially for peak hours.
- Public concerns are being dismissed based on flawed data.
- Approving annexation now would ignore these issues and risk major negative impacts for current and future residents.

On Tue, Jun 24, 2025 at 2:55 PM Baxter, Tamara <Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Mr. Tompkins,

The are for the same project.

The applicant chose to submit a development plan, a more detailed view of what is being proposed, on the heels of annexation, zone establishment and land use plan.

They can do this, with risk to themselves.

I have attached some steps to view all project related files.

The associated active files numbers are as follows:

DEPN-25-0072

ZONE-25-0015

LUPL-25-0006

ANEX-24-0016

Let me know if you have any additional comments.



Tamara Baxter

Planning Supervisor – North Planning Area Team

Planning Department

City of Colorado Springs

Main Office: (719) 385-5905

Direct: (719) 385-5621

Email: tamara.baxter@coloradosprings.gov

Links:

[Planning and Neighborhood Services](#)

[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#) [before August 8, 2022]

[Look at Applications Online](#) [after August 8, 2022] | [ACA Guide](#)

[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)

[Application & Checklists](#)

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

From: John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:45 PM

To: Baxter, Tamara <Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: Re: Statement Opposing the Proposed Miller Downs Annexation

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 Tamara,

In addition to my previous questions.

I received another notice with a Deadline of July 1 for response. Please consider my initial e-mail in opposition to this as well. I'm not sure why the same project was filed twice. This notice has a record number of DEPN-25-0072.

Thank you,

John Tompkins

719-357-5843

On Mon, Jun 16, 2025 at 1:08 PM John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com> wrote:

Thanks Tamara.

What's the schedule of events for this? Last time Onea Miller and the developers we're required to hold a meeting for questions from residents. I didn't see an option for that, this time.

Thanks

John Tompkins

On Mon, Jun 16, 2025, 11:46 AM Baxter, Tamara <Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Mr. Tompkins,

The Planning Department appreciates your comments and interest in this project.

Your comments will be provided to the applicant for a response as part of a subsequent submittal of the Development Plan and will also be considered by staff.

I have also passed along your comments to Stormwater Enterprise and City Traffic Engineering.

If you have any further comments or questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.



Tamara Baxter

Planning Supervisor – North Planning Area Team

Planning Department

City of Colorado Springs

Main Office: (719) 385-5905

Direct: (719) 385-5621

Email: tamara.baxter@coloradosprings.gov

NOTE: I will be out of the office June 2nd - June 12th.

Links:

[Planning and Neighborhood Services](#)

[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#) [before August 8, 2022]

[Look at Applications Online](#) [after August 8, 2022] | [ACA Guide](#)

[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)

[Application & Checklists](#)

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

From: John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2025 9:26 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara <Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov>
Cc: John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com>
Subject: Statement Opposing the Proposed Miller Downs Annexation

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 the Colorado Springs City Council and Community Stakeholders:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed annexation of the 21.37-acre Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1. This proposal, which seeks to add 5-7 dwellings per acre near a creek, raises significant concerns for the city and the surrounding community. The main issues—insufficient road infrastructure, and risks to the adjacent creek from construction runoff—make this annexation not in the best interests of Colorado Springs.

Road Infrastructure Is Inadequate

The current road network in the area is not equipped to handle the increased traffic that would result from adding over 100 new homes. Past regional transportation plans have shown that Colorado Springs faces ongoing challenges in keeping up with road expansions and upgrades to match new developments¹. Without substantial improvements, this annexation will worsen congestion, increase commute times, and strain emergency response capabilities. These issues were already factors when the annexation was previously denied, and no significant changes have been made to address them. The neighborhood to the west currently has 153 lots spread over approximately 58 acres. This new annexation is up to 150 lots over less than half the amount of land. (21 acres) This density is absolutely insane. The annexation is not near any metro stops and I find it hard to believe the one road into it will be able to support 300 cars daily. (@ 2 cars per dwelling). These cars will be traversing through an existing neighborhood that wasn't built for this amount of traffic.

Runoff and Creek Health Risks

Construction on previously undeveloped land near a creek poses serious risks for stormwater runoff and erosion. Even with city and state stormwater controls, the initial phases of development are when the greatest risk occurs: disturbed soil washes into streets, sewers, and ultimately into local waterways⁴. If not managed perfectly, this runoff can degrade water quality, harm aquatic habitats, and increase flood risks for downstream residents. The city has seen firsthand the costly and damaging effects of inadequate stormwater management in other urbanized watersheds, such

as North Douglas Creek, where channel degradation and infrastructure failures resulted in millions of dollars in repairs and environmental harm⁵. There is no evidence that the current annexation plan has addressed these risks any better than before. The density of the housing actually looks worse than before.

No Substantial Change from the Previous Proposal

This annexation was already turned down once, and as far as can be determined, nothing material has changed in the proposal to address the core concerns. The city's annexation process rightly requires not just procedural compliance but also a substantive review of whether such growth is in the best interest of the community. Given the ongoing deficiencies in infrastructure, water supply, and environmental protection, this proposal does not meet that standard.

Utility Costs Not Factored In?

I don't see financial implications factored in, on the website.

<https://coloradosprings.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7375832&GUID=2DFDB6CD-8FA9-41AA-9799-0A0D063AA26C&Options=&Search=&FullText=1>

Colorado Springs residents are often concerned about who bears the true costs of utility expansion when new developments are annexed. While city code and utility policies state that developers are required to pay for the design, installation, and construction of all necessary electric, gas, water, wastewater, and stormwater systems to serve their developments, the reality is more complex¹²³⁴.

Recent large-scale annexations, such as the Karman Line and Amara projects, have shown that even when developers are responsible for on-site infrastructure, the costs of extending major utility systems—especially off-site or regional upgrades—are frequently financed by Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) using funds collected from all ratepayers¹⁵⁶. These costs can be substantial; for example, the East Wastewater System Expansion project was nearly \$400 million, with CSU planning to recoup the costs over time through recovery fees and higher utility rates for all customers¹. In some cases, this has led to average utility bills increasing by hundreds of dollars per year for local families¹⁵.

Furthermore, while recent policy changes require developers to pay 100% of the direct costs for electric and natural gas line extensions starting in 2025, customers still share in the burden for broader system expansions and upgrades through base rates and additional fees⁴⁵. This means that even if the proposed development does not list explicit costs, residents will likely bear some of the financial responsibility for expanding and maintaining the city's utility infrastructure to accommodate new growth.

Despite official requirements that developers pay for utility extensions, Colorado Springs residents frequently end up shouldering significant costs for major utility expansions through increased rates and fees.¹⁵⁶

Conclusion

Colorado Springs must prioritize responsible, sustainable growth that does not outpace its infrastructure or natural resources. Approving the Miller Downs annexation as currently proposed would undermine those priorities and set a troubling precedent for future development. While development in this area is unavoidable, the density should at least make sense. I urge the City Council to reject this annexation and instead focus on solutions that protect our roads, water, and environment for current and future residents.

Sources Hyperlinked for ease.

<https://pikespeakhabitat.org/handling-storm-water-at-the-build-site/>

https://www.codot.gov/programs/planning/assets/plans-projects-reports/Previous-Plans/2035-regional-plans/ppacg/all_ppacg_appendices.pdf

Respectfully submitted,

John Tompkins

[6716 Silver Star Ln. Colorado Springs, CO 80923](#)

719-357-5843

Baxter, Tamara

From: John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, June 30, 2025 4:38 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Re: Statement Opposing the Proposed Miller Downs Annexation
Attachments: Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane_Traffic Study.pdf

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 Tamara,

I looked at the traffic generation study that Kimley Horn proposed and I had some questions/concerns on their methodology. For numbers, we'll stick with the 140 homes that have been proposed.

1. Trip Generation Numbers: Daily vs. Peak Hour

- The study states that the Miller Downs development will generate 1,130 weekday daily vehicle trips, with 79 trips during the morning peak hour and 100 trips during the afternoon peak hour
- **Flaw:** The ratio of peak hour trips to daily trips appears low. Typically, for residential developments, the AM and PM peak hours each account for about 8-10% of daily trips (combined, 16-20%). Here, the AM peak is about 7% (79/1130), and the PM peak is about 9% (100/1130). While this is not impossible, it is at the low end of ITE Trip Generation Manual expectations for residential uses, which usually see higher peak hour shares. This could suggest an underestimation of peak hour impacts or an overestimation of daily trips, or both.

2. Trip Generation Methodology

- The report uses ITE Trip Generation Manual 11th Edition rates for single-family detached (210) and attached (215) housing
- The calculations in Appendix D show:
 - 54 detached units: 510 daily trips, 38 AM peak hour, 51 PM peak hour.
 - 86 attached units: 620 daily trips, 41 AM peak hour, 49 PM peak hour.
 - Totals: 1,130 daily, 79 AM, 100 PM.
- **Flaw:** The ITE rates used for AM and PM peak hours (0.70 and 0.94 for detached; 0.48 and 0.57 for attached) are within the published range, but the daily rates (9.43 for detached, 7.20 for attached) are at the higher end. If the daily rates are high, but the peak hour rates are average/low, this could skew the analysis to make peak hour impacts appear less significant relative to daily traffic.

3. Consistency with ITE Data

- According to the ITE Manual, the daily-to-peak-hour ratio for residential uses is generally consistent across studies. If the study is using a higher daily rate but average peak hour rates, the peak hour percentages will appear artificially low.
- **Flaw:** This may understate the impact during the busiest times of day, which is when traffic congestion and operational issues are most likely to occur. The study should provide

justification if the local context supports such a low peak hour share, but no such justification is given.

4. Potential Impact on Intersection Analysis

- Since intersection level of service (LOS) and queuing analyses are based on peak hour volumes, underestimating peak hour trips could result in an overly optimistic assessment of intersection performance and the need for mitigation
- If the actual peak hour volumes are higher than projected, intersections may operate at a lower LOS than reported, and queuing could be underestimated. The intersection at Black Forest and Woodmen can be assumed to be the main entrance/exit for this development. That intersection is already really bad with traffic in the morning and afternoons. I could be mistaken but I don't think I saw an analysis of this intersection. As more trailers and apartments go up along Adventure Way, I suspect this is only going to get much worse. And those areas are already a part of Colorado Springs.

5. Lack of Sensitivity Analysis

- The study does not appear to include a sensitivity analysis or discussion of what happens if peak hour trip generation is higher than projected. I believe this is a standard best practice, especially when trip generation ratios are at the low end.

6. Other Observations

- The study does not mention internal capture or pass-by trip adjustments; if these were applied, they should be explicitly stated.
- The report does not provide contextual justification (e.g., unique travel patterns, high transit use, or walkability) that would explain a lower-than-typical peak hour share.

Please let me know if I'm off base with any of this.

Thanks
John Tompkins

On Tue, Jun 24, 2025 at 2:55 PM Baxter, Tamara <Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Mr. Tompkins,

The are for the same project.

The applicant chose to submit a development plan, a more detailed view of what is being proposed, on the heels of annexation, zone establishment and land use plan.

They can do this, with risk to themselves.

I have attached some steps to view all project related files.

The associated active files numbers are as follows:

DEPN-25-0072

ZONE-25-0015

LUPL-25-0006

ANEX-24-0016

Let me know if you have any additional comments.



Tamara Baxter

Planning Supervisor – North Planning Area Team

Planning Department

City of Colorado Springs

Main Office: (719) 385-5905

Direct: (719) 385-5621

Email: tamara.baxter@coloradosprings.gov

Links:

[Planning and Neighborhood Services](#)

[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#) [before August 8, 2022]

[Look at Applications Online](#) [after August 8, 2022] | [ACA Guide](#)

[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)

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

From: John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:45 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara <Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Statement Opposing the Proposed Miller Downs Annexation

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 Tamara,

In addition to my previous questions.

I received another notice with a Deadline of July 1 for response. Please consider my initial e-mail in opposition to this as well. I'm not sure why the same project was filed twice. This notice has a record number of DEPN-25-0072.

Thank you,

John Tompkins

719-357-5843

On Mon, Jun 16, 2025 at 1:08 PM John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com> wrote:

Thanks Tamara.

What's the schedule of events for this? Last time Onea Miller and the developers we're required to hold a meeting for questions from residents. I didn't see an option for that, this time.

Thanks

John Tompkins

On Mon, Jun 16, 2025, 11:46 AM Baxter, Tamara <Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Mr. Tompkins,

The Planning Department appreciates your comments and interest in this project.

Your comments will be provided to the applicant for a response as part of a subsequent submittal of the Development Plan and will also be considered by staff.

I have also passed along your comments to Stormwater Enterprise and City Traffic Engineering.

If you have any further comments or questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.



Tamara Baxter

Planning Supervisor – North Planning Area Team

Planning Department

City of Colorado Springs

Main Office: (719) 385-5905

Direct: (719) 385-5621

Email: tamara.baxter@coloradosprings.gov

NOTE: I will be out of the office June 2nd - June 12th.

Links:

[Planning and Neighborhood Services](#)

[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#) [before August 8, 2022]

[Look at Applications Online](#) [after August 8, 2022] | [ACA Guide](#)

[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)

[Application & Checklists](#)

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

From: John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2025 9:26 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara <Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov>
Cc: John Tompkins <dbldwn02@gmail.com>
Subject: Statement Opposing the Proposed Miller Downs Annexation

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 the Colorado Springs City Council and Community Stakeholders:

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed annexation of the 21.37-acre Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane Addition No. 1. This proposal, which seeks to add 5-7 dwellings per acre near a creek, raises significant concerns for the city and the surrounding community. The main issues—insufficient road infrastructure, and risks to the adjacent creek from construction runoff—make this annexation not in the best interests of Colorado Springs.

Road Infrastructure Is Inadequate

The current road network in the area is not equipped to handle the increased traffic that would result from adding over 100 new homes. Past regional transportation plans have shown that Colorado Springs faces ongoing challenges in keeping up with road expansions and upgrades to match new developments¹. Without substantial improvements, this annexation will worsen congestion, increase commute times, and strain emergency response capabilities. These issues were already factors when the annexation was previously denied, and no significant changes have been made to address them. The neighborhood to the west currently has 153 lots spread over approximately 58 acres. This new annexation is up to 150 lots over less than half the amount of land. (21 acres) This density is absolutely insane. The annexation is not near any metro stops and I find it hard to believe the one road into it will be able to support 300 cars daily. (@ 2 cars per dwelling). These cars will be traversing through an existing neighborhood that wasn't built for this amount of traffic.

Runoff and Creek Health Risks

Construction on previously undeveloped land near a creek poses serious risks for stormwater runoff and erosion. Even with city and state stormwater controls, the initial phases of development are when the greatest risk occurs: disturbed soil washes into streets, sewers, and ultimately into local waterways⁴. If not managed perfectly, this runoff can degrade water quality, harm aquatic habitats, and increase flood risks for downstream residents. The city has seen firsthand the costly and damaging effects of inadequate stormwater management in other urbanized watersheds, such as North Douglas Creek, where channel degradation and infrastructure failures resulted in millions of dollars in repairs and environmental harm⁵. There is no evidence that the current annexation plan has addressed these risks any better than before. The density of the housing actually looks worse than before.

No Substantial Change from the Previous Proposal

This annexation was already turned down once, and as far as can be determined, nothing material has changed in the proposal to address the core concerns. The city's annexation process rightly requires not just procedural compliance but also a substantive review of whether such growth is in the best interest of the community. Given the ongoing deficiencies in infrastructure, water supply, and environmental protection, this proposal does not meet that standard.

Utility Costs Not Factored In?

I don't see financial implications factored in, on the website.

<https://coloradosprings.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7375832&GUID=2DFDB6CD-8FA9-41AA-9799-0A0D063AA26C&Options=&Search=&FullText=1>

Colorado Springs residents are often concerned about who bears the true costs of utility expansion when new developments are annexed. While city code and utility policies state that developers are

required to pay for the design, installation, and construction of all necessary electric, gas, water, wastewater, and stormwater systems to serve their developments, the reality is more complex¹²³⁴.

Recent large-scale annexations, such as the Karman Line and Amara projects, have shown that even when developers are responsible for on-site infrastructure, the costs of extending major utility systems—especially off-site or regional upgrades—are frequently financed by Colorado Springs Utilities (CSU) using funds collected from all ratepayers¹⁵⁶. These costs can be substantial; for example, the East Wastewater System Expansion project was nearly \$400 million, with CSU planning to recoup the costs over time through recovery fees and higher utility rates for all customers¹. In some cases, this has led to average utility bills increasing by hundreds of dollars per year for local families¹⁵.

Furthermore, while recent policy changes require developers to pay 100% of the direct costs for electric and natural gas line extensions starting in 2025, customers still share in the burden for broader system expansions and upgrades through base rates and additional fees⁴⁵. This means that even if the proposed development does not list explicit costs, residents will likely bear some of the financial responsibility for expanding and maintaining the city's utility infrastructure to accommodate new growth.

Despite official requirements that developers pay for utility extensions, Colorado Springs residents frequently end up shouldering significant costs for major utility expansions through increased rates and fees¹⁵⁶.

Conclusion

Colorado Springs must prioritize responsible, sustainable growth that does not outpace its infrastructure or natural resources. Approving the Miller Downs annexation as currently proposed would undermine those priorities and set a troubling precedent for future development. While development in this area is unavoidable, the density should at least make sense. I urge the City Council to reject this annexation and instead focus on solutions that protect our roads, water, and environment for current and future residents.

Sources Hyperlinked for ease.

<https://pikespeakhabitat.org/handling-storm-water-at-the-build-site/>

https://www.codot.gov/programs/planning/assets/plans-projects-reports/Previous-Plans/2035-regional-plans/ppacg/all_ppacg_appendices.pdf

Respectfully submitted,

John Tompkins

[6716 Silver Star Ln. Colorado Springs, CO 80923](#)

719-357-5843

Baxter, Tamara

From: Cathia Bell <cathiabellqbc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 24, 2025 11:25 AM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Cc: Tamara Baxter
Subject: Re: Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane

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!

Thank you for this. I disagree with their traffic study. Is there a way to get an independent traffic study? In our neighborhood right now- many people park on the street, the roads aren't super wide and people often have to pull over to allow traffic coming from the other way to pass. Adding more traffic to our neighborhood is going to make getting in and out of our neighborhood even worse. When is the public meeting?

Thanks,

Cathia Bell
Quail Brush Creek
719-291-4676

On Wed, Jul 23, 2025 at 10:06 PM Baxter, Tamara <Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

You are receiving this email as you have expressed interest in the Miller Downs project.

The applicant team has made a resubmittal.

All documents can be found in the following files:

LUPL-25-0006

ANEX-24-0016

ZONE-25-0015

I have attached directions to view documents.

Please let me know if you have any questions.



Tamara Baxter

Planning Supervisor – North Planning Area Team

Planning Department

City of Colorado Springs

Main Office: (719) 385-5905

Direct: (719) 385-5621

Email: tamara.baxter@coloradosprings.gov

Links:

[Planning and Neighborhood Services](#)

[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#) [before August 8, 2022]

[Look at Applications Online](#) [after August 8, 2022] | [ACA Guide](#)

[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)

[Application & Checklists](#)

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

Baxter, Tamara

From: Andrea Holzer <ahwoughter@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 27, 2025 2:49 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara; Rainey Jr, Roland
Subject: Objections to Millers Downs at Wyoming Lane development through Quail Brush Creek

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. Baxter

I already wrote my opposition to this development earlier but I started a petition and I wanted you to have it before the meeting so the developers know it's coming. The metro district suggested I get as many people to respond as possible - this a petition.

Councilman Rainey

Hello my name is Andrea Holzer and I'm a resident in your district. I live in Quail Brush Creek (QBC) Spruce Hill Court, 80923. My telephone number is 719 985 5248 if that is helpful. Sorry to send this lengthy petition to you mid stream without a warning. To sum things up as best I can a developer has been trying to develop the land behind our development for sometime now and it's a complicated matter dominated by safety concerns and the developers less than smart idea of putting both the point of entry and exit to the new development through QBC. We feel this is a dangerous situation for many reasons and would require annexing and paving Wyoming Lane to even be half safe. Since you are my city councilman I urge you to consider how the city develops and pay closer attention to not well thought out developments such as this one. There is a neighborhood meeting on Thursday July 31 , 2025 from 5:30 - 7:00 pm at the Mountain Springs church at 7375 Adventure Way if you can join us.

Petition against Millers Downs at Wyoming Lane development

Dear developers of the proposed Millers Downs at Wyoming lane, case planner Tamara Baxter and honorable city councilman Roland Rainey Jr.

We the residents of the Quail Brush Creek development oppose the development of the proposed Millers Downs at Wyoming Lane

(MDWL) project (record number Annex-24-0016, Zone 25-0006, DEPN-25-0072, LUPL-25-0006) on the grounds that the present proposal will pose significant safety, noise, road maintenance, unfair tax burdens and issues of potentially not being able to get insurance on our homes or not afford the insurance for our homes due to the increased fire danger rating QBC might receive under the present proposal of putting both the point of entry and exit to MDWL through QBC.

To elaborate:

The proposed name of the development is Millers Downs at Wyoming Lane, thus if the development is to happen, we request that the city first annex and pave Wyoming Lane. Subsequent to annexing and paving Wyoming Lane, then any construction traffic can enter and exit MDWL via Wyoming Lane. A second point of exit or entry could potentially come through QBC , after numerous issues below are addressed, allowing all of us to reside here in safety and still afford our insurance.

Points we would like addressed:

1) Home owners insurance. According to Homes.com QBC's fire factor rating is a 5/10, putting us into a high insurance category (my insurance company confirmed this - as I am presently shopping to see if I can get a better rate, which appears unlikely. According to my insurer I am lucky to have insurance here and if the QBC fire rating increases my insurer might pull out of here or up premiums so far that I'll try to find a new insurer, who will jump ship after a while or ask me for a sum I can't afford- forcing me to choose between insurance coverage or putting myself in peril by not having insurance).

Putting both points of in and egress within QBC will most likely increase our fire rating, putting many of us in this predicament of selling our homes to move to a lower fire rating area, doing without insurance, or begging any insurer to take us on at a king's ransom when the company's reputation is not necessarily good.

We believe that not annexing Wyoming Lane and putting both points of entry within QBC will not only increase our fire rating for insurance purposes, but significantly increase the chances of

not being able to evacuate all 235 homes in QBC plus now another 146 homes in MDWL.

We would like to see

(a) data for how our fire rating will not increase by the present circumventing of laws requiring two separate points of entry and exit. At present this proposal may narrowly meet these requirements, but our argument is that these points of entry and egress are not separate and independent of one another and will endanger all residents' welfare, lives, and finances.

(b) we would like to see a comprehensive mass evacuation plan by our fire department, police department and any other safety agencies for how we can get all these households safely evacuated. Our contention is that even at present evacuation all 235 households in QBC is not or barely possible- as we are restricted by the development that forces us to exit over Flowering Almond drive and now at least for a while we can not go east on Dublin, to go to Peterson Road and possibly Marksheffel - which is and had been under construction for years now. Our other point of exit is QBC drive to adventure way to hopefully Woodmen. QBC drive via Adventure way is at best

a lottery type situation , especially during bad weather, and complicated by the almost 40 homes squeezed into the tight area right at the top of QBC drive , further impeding our chances of getting to Woodmen road. About two years ago there was a fire in a mobile home/camper at one of the landscapers off QBC drive and while our Fire department responded valiantly this small fire closed QBC drive for about 3 hours . About 4 years ago we were on pre evacuation orders for fire due to someone off Dublin Blvd dumping hot coals over their wooden fence into the dry brush (I believe two homes were damaged severely). We here at QBC would not have been able to exit. My mentor - a fire chief for CSFD- told me he didn't think we could get out and to stay put. No one could get in here either and some of my neighbors got panicked calls from other neighbors asking us to grab their pets as they could not get in to rescue them.

2) There seems to be significant confusion about who owns and should be maintaining the roads within QBC, resulting in lack or awareness of how dangerous particularly QBC drive into Thornbrush is. Additionally no one is aware of the number of

accidents on that stretch of road especially in bad weather. We need an investigation into who owns the roads here, followed by a road traffic study and then catching up on long neglected maintenance and signage needs. We also need additional policing through our neighborhood as 45 plus MPH speeds are commonplace here.

It would be dangerous and fool hearty to add additional residents to use these roads until we can be sure they are properly repaired, maintained, signed and patrolled.

(A) we ask for a clarification of who owns these roads.

(B) we ask that these roads be brought up to maintenance standards. We ask for a proposal and timing of what repairs will occur when and what signage, speed bumps, and enforcement will happen.

(C) we ask for a safety study of these roads especially in cold icy weather and want a proposal on how to mitigate that curve at QBC drive to Thornbrush.

(D) should these roads be traveled and impeded on by heavy construction traffic, we ask for a proposal of when these roads will be repaired, by

whom this financial burden be carried, what will be done in case of a mass evacuation event (we can not accommodate those large vehicles blocking our roads) and most importantly what will be done during the construction phase to assure our safety and ability to come and go.

(E) we want a comprehensive traffic pattern study and evacuation plan for our development should you choose to add MDWL but only after you annex Wyoming Lane.

(F) if the MDWL development happens the annexation and development of Wyoming Lane is necessary and would give QBC a potential point of egress in a mass evacuation event- we would like to see a plan to confirm that this would actually be a benefit.

3) QBC is part of a metro district, which with it carries a significant tax burden to each and every homeowner within QBC. These additional taxes were in part to pay for the roads here, and the issue of fair compensation to the residents of QBC needs to be addressed with the metro district. I understand this issue has been brought up by the metro district. We want to hear how much of our bonds will be paid off early if the MDWL

development does come through QBC as proposed. It is one thing for these roads to be used by the occasional passer through, but residents of any proposed development who would use our roads regularly and benefit while at the same time degrading our roads faster need to participate in the expense incurred. Please settle the issue of a buy out fee to the metro district and how that fee will be applied to pay off our bond. Alternatively if MDWL does opt into the metro district once again there needs to be financial compensation to QBC residents , for right now we will still carry a significant tax burden for 20 more years for these roads.

(4) There are other issues at play here, such as QBC's calm score of 86/100 according to Homes.com, will surely decrease. We would like to see proposals for how to mitigate those factors and compensate QBC residents for loss of quality of life.

This by no means is a comprehensive list of issues, but those that come to mind to the author of this petition and we ask that future issues not be excluded from further discussion.

Sincerely Andrea Holzer
(QBC resident since

Sent from my iPhone

Baxter, Tamara

From: Kirby Thompson <kirby@brittonflowers.com>
Sent: Friday, July 25, 2025 2:08 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane

You don't often get email from kirby@brittonflowers.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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 Tamara,

My wife and I reside at 7075 Wyoming Lane, adjacent just east of the 22-acre parcel at 7020 Wyoming Lane that is currently under contract to be purchased and developed into single family homes for sale as the "Miller Downs." My wife has lived on this same property since 1979 and I've been living here on the property since Stephanie and I got married in 1998. We have always known that the Miller's 22 acres would eventually be developed and although we would much rather see the property remain as "open space" we understand that its highest and best use for the city is to create this new neighborhood.

Our interactions with the developers of the Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane neighborhood have been entirely positive and we believe the neighborhood they intend to create will be good for the city and good for our community. They are very sensitive to the needs of the surrounding neighborhoods and we feel that they have done due diligence to consider all the concerns that neighbors have expressed.

Therefore we would like you to know that **we are in support of the Miller Downs at Wyoming Lane project** and we encourage you to approve their request for annexation, zone establishment and the development plan that they have submitted. My wife and I plan to attend the neighborhood meeting next Thursday July 31 to voice our support of the project.

Please contact me if you have any questions or need any clarification!

All The Best,

Kirby and Stephanie Thompson
7075 Wyoming Lane
Colorado Springs, CO 80923
Cellular: 719.360.3634

Baxter, Tamara

From: larrydrive@aol.com
Sent: Monday, July 28, 2025 4:48 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Cc: Larry Driver
Subject: Opposition to proposed development of Miller Downs Neighborhood

You don't often get email from larrydrive@aol.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

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

Dear, City Planner

I am writing as a concerned resident to formally express my opposition to the proposed residential development on the 22-acre parcel of land located across the road from Britton Nursery.

While I understand the pressures of growth and the potential appeal of new housing, I believe this particular development poses significant and lasting harm to the surrounding community. Specifically, I am concerned about the following:

- **Increased Traffic and Safety**

Risks: The existing roads and infrastructure are already under strain. Adding dozens of new single-family homes will only exacerbate traffic congestion and raise safety concerns, particularly in areas near schools, businesses, and residential zones.

- **Loss of Open Space and**

Greenery: The proposed site provides a vital buffer of open land and mature trees, contributing to the aesthetic and ecological health of our neighborhood. Eliminating this space for dense development diminishes our community's connection to nature and

impacts wildlife habitat

- **Noise and Quality of Life**

Impacts: Additional construction and residential activity will inevitably increase noise and reduce the overall quality of life for current residents, especially those adjacent to the property.

- **Irreversible Change to Neighborhood Character:** One of the defining features of this area is its open, peaceful environment. Rapid development threatens to replace that character with congestion, overdevelopment, and diminished community identity.

I urge the Planning Department to consider the broader and long-term implications of this project, and to give equal weight to the voices of those who live here and will be most affected by this decision.

Thank you for your time and thoughtful consideration.

Sincerely ,
Larry Driver
7150 Nevada Lane
719-495-2791