

PUBLIC COMMENT

Prospect Village

ZONE-24-00017, CUDP-24-0014, DEPN-24-0123, DVSA-24-0004, DVSA-24-0005, DVSA-24-0006, and SUBD-24-0104

3103 N Prosect St



1. **Brad Fairbanks**
August 25, 2024

Mr. Gray - I am a neighbor of this property. While I am not opposed to the opportunity to develop this lot, the plan as stated is unsuitable for the plot of land involved. I believe the project to be too large for the location. Point by point 1. 18 tiny homes are a lot. How are they proposing to fit 18 homes, a parking lot, and a green space on this space of land. I have driven by the tiny home lot on Las Animas, and it looks like a lot of people unwillingly crushed into a tiny space. I also notice the landscaping down there has been lacking, so it looks like a mess. I obviously do not want that in my neighborhood. 2. So many variances for a project would indicate that this lot obviously, as it, cannot handle the size of the project. 3. $\frac{1}{2}$ a car space per lot is unreasonable. Everybody has 1 car, or a friend that has one car. The neighborhood will have a hard time handling the parking, especially when the summer sports are going across the street at Flanagan Park. 4. Space per house is 850 sqft. Another obvious sign the lot cannot handle the scope of the project.

The previous renters of the lot were, as you are now proposing, a group of young adults. They were loud, liked to party, and did zero maintenance around the property. I foresee the exact same problems happening if the project continues as planned.

I believe this should go back to the drawing board with a much smaller number of tiny homes, with more space per home, and parking for all residents. It is not the project I am opposed to, it is the size and scope that I believe is unattainable, and not suited to the neighborhood.

Thank you for noting my concerns,
Brad Fairbanks

2. **Nelson Family and Prospect Holdings, LLC**
August 26, 2024

Dear Mr. Gray,

We received notice of the above-referenced proposed development. As owners of 3026 Prospect Street, we earnestly request that the city reject the rezoning request.

This project, if allowed, will cause hardship on the area residents, including those in our six-plex. The proposed density in a quiet neighborhood will adversely affect our tenants with noise, traffic and parking concerns. Allowing ONE HALF parking space for each unit will exacerbate the existing problem of shortage of street parking.

I live in a neighborhood with a homeowners' association. One of the residents recently applied for a variance that would allow another home to be built on his property. The owner knew the existing laws, the zoning of the property when he bought it, as well as the rules of the homeowners' association. His request for a zoning change was dismissed by the Planning Commission.

Likewise, the owner of the subject property is or should have been aware of the existing zoning when he bought the property. If the city grants this zoning change, with the request for such an extreme departure from existing laws, then one wonders why we even have zoning laws.

Were this a request from an individual, we doubt it would even be considered. So, speculation is this may be a government -sponsored project perhaps to house street people or illegals.

Please protect the homeowners and residents in this area so they may enjoy their properties. We already have problems with street parking and vagrants. Residents have chosen the neighborhood and pay property taxes because they cherish the peace and quiet that high-density housing cannot provide.

We respectfully request that you protect our property rights and values as well as residents' quality of life. and reject this proposed development.

Nelson Family, Prospect Holdings LLC

3. **Arthur Messer**
August 26, 2024

William Gray

In Response to the proposed "Prospect Village, Tiny House Community for 'Underprivileged' Youth" at 3103 N. Prospect.

Like many longtime residents of the Papeton neighborhood, I have been Privy to many neighborhood observations. Particularly regarding government (excuse me... Taxpayer) funded housing. Without exception, these "Free" houses to the vagrants of our society are replete with drug deals, drug use and the display of the accompanying and inevitable criminal activity. The Papeton neighborhood's Flanagan Park currently runs a competing race with South Nevada's Dorchester Park in regard to vagrancy and drug dealings, done in plain sight with no fear of retribution. Once again, those of us who wish to live in peace in

our neighborhood without fear of illegal activity, have to deal with our esteemed city leaders' "wisdom" in forcing choice neighborhoods to handle the city council's self-created problems. This is one of many never-ending issues for which the council continues to pick their constituency's pockets. (e.g. Ford Amphitheater, High Rise concerns downtown, scooters, bike lanes, etc)

In addition to this city government's unending desire to pilfer increasing amounts of our hard-earned money, the decision to put these "at risk" youth directly across the street from the aforementioned drug and vagrancy park (Flanagan) seems questionable at best. (That question perhaps being one of ethics?) Once again, taxpayers are burdened with council's unwillingness to properly deal with the root of the problem. With the proposed increase of this questionable population into the Papeton neighborhood that the residents continue to have to deal with - as well as finance - council is increasing the risk to these *beneficiaries*' by moving them next to this park. They are also increasing the risk to the entirety of the neighborhood with the behavior that is sure to follow. Speaking for many in this city - I'm sure - we are tiring of Council's questionable and seemingly self-benefiting decision making, especially about vagrancy.

Regardless of where the money initially originates, we all know what the road to hell is paved with. Surely there is plenty of room out east that the city can commandeer to move these lost souls so that they can enjoy the lifestyle they have chosen without forcing them or the public once again into a situation no one is happy with...?

I'll speak plainly ... I am hopeful that - as Pueblo Sheriff Samuel Carron displayed his courage and proper attitude in dealing with a similar situation in removing Charles "Pretty Boy" Floyd from the population for vagrancy in 1929 - surely one day our leaders will relearn the timeless lesson Sheriff Carron once knew by putting taxpaying constituency first and foremost over those that choose vagrancy and drugs as a lifestyle. A choice that enables council to happily fleece the taxpayers and leave their neighborhoods to risk.

4. **Thomas Fleming**
July 11, 2024

Hello Mr. Gray,

We have had a development plan in the works for a while at 3017 N. Prospect. We have had to meet all the city's requirements as far as setbacks and parking goes. They have even set us back an extra 10 feet along Prospect in case they wanted to widen the road later. If that is not the case we would like to get our 10 feet back.

Not opposed to the project but would like to know what's up so we can get some of the same benefits.

Thanks
Thomas Fleming

5. **Steve Gubser**
August 25, 2024

Hello Mr. Gray,

I am responding to the Standard Notice regarding Prospect Village.

I am all for multi-family usage of the proposed lot, however, I have the following concerns/feedback:

1) Parking Requirement: Reducing the parking requirement to 1/2 space per tiny house does not make sense to me. This area of town is not "walkable friendly". Anyone who lives here will need a vehicle. To date, I do

not know of any vehicle manufacturers offering 1/2 cars for sale, so this will force at least 9 residents to seek on street parking. I view on street parking generally as a problem, and I think Colorado Springs does as well, hence the many, many regulations and requirements for off street parking for new developments. I would hope Colorado Springs does not grant this variance. It will cause traffic problems, unsightly visual problems for the neighborhood and generally reduce property values. In general, it will reduce the quality and tranquility of living in the area.

2) Setbacks: Much effort has gone into the zoning standards, including setbacks for Colorado Springs, and these standards have been adopted and enforced for many reasons. Reduction of the setback requirement would change the look and feel of the area/neighborhood for the worse. It would reduce the quality of life of those living adjacent as well as reduce the values of adjacent properties.

Development of this property should be done so within the current Colorado Springs requirements of Setbacks and Parking Requirements without granting conditional uses or variances.

Thanks,
Steve Gubser

6. **Stephen Marzulla**
August 24, 2024


Hello,

This comment is regarding the Project Name: Prospect Village Tiny House Community, specifically addressing the infrastructure of the roads accessing the site. In short, the N. Arcadia Street is not wide enough to support the number of new homes and the vehicles they will bring, even with the proposed parking lot.

As seen on the google maps screenshot, where the property touches Arcadia Street, the road is narrow to only a single lane as both sides is utilized by current homeowners to park their vehicles. From 3016 N Arcadia to 3104 N Arcadia the road is treated as a one lane with one vehicle required to give the right of way to another, as two cars cannot pass if there are any vehicles parked on the side. Adding 18 homes, -8 of them closer to the Arcadia Street will dramatically increase the traffic along Arcadia causing headache for everyone having to drive through.

The Second note is the current Landscape Plan has a parking lot attached to N Arcadia Street for 7 vehicles. This is 7 vehicles for 18 homes. From the Landscape Plan, it looks to be that 5 additional vehicles can be parked on the property on Prospect Street. If every home has a vehicle, - given the infrastructure in Colorado Springs, you absolutely need a vehicle, that is only enough parking for 12 units. With the existing home on property, it is assumed services will be on sight causing people commuting with vehicles to add additional space to our roads. Where is the overflow parking going to be? Is Flanagan Park expected to be semi-permanent overflow parking?

Suggestion: I would request to adjust the plans to reduce 1-2 units, specifically TH17 and TH18 according to the Landscape plan to offer more parking for a property adding more people/families, to better work with the flow on an already congested street - N Arcadia St. I support all other aspects of the plan and plat change if the Parking is corrected.



Stephen Marzulla

7. **Janet McDougall**
September 2, 2024

Dear Mr. Gray,

My name is Janet McDougall. I live at Colorado Springs Senior Homes (CSSH). My address is 3102 North Prospect Street in the Springs, directly across the street from the proposed development site. CSSH has several residents who are elderly, physically disabled or who have memory problems. On walks, they move slowly. I am concerned for their safety. Motorists frequently exceed the speed limit. Parking spaces would be a major concern as well.

I understand some of the potential residents have been unhoused, living on the streets or coming out of foster care. Is there a plan to orient the individuals to now live in an established neighborhood?
Will there be a HOA?

I am hoping the potential residents will blend in well into the neighborhood. I want to maintain the integrity, health and safety of my community.

Please continue to communicate with us via posted signs, emails or publication in the Gazette.
Thank you.

Sincerely,
Janet McDougall