

Arrowswest Apartments
ZONE-24-0004 and DEPN-24-0039
4145 Arrowswest Drive



- Dear Sir

I completely object to this development.
Have you been on Garden of the Gods Road and 30th Street? At ALL?
Traffic, traffic, traffic.
Try from 6am to 8:30 am and from 3:00pm to 6:00pm.
It's hard enough to get out of this area without the increase of traffic we are already experiencing.
This is a safety issue. AND an eyesore on the way to one our most popular attractions: Garden of the Gods.
NO to the approval of the Arrowswest Apartment.

Jackie B. Carr
Resident and homeowner, Mountain Shadows

- Dear Mayor Mobolade,

During your campaign, you were [interviewed by Andrea Chalfin with KRCC](#) in which she asked about the 2424 development on Garden of the Gods which City Council denied due to public safety risks, and the courts upheld that decision noting the testimony by Councilmember that show development at that location violates 7.5.603.B that zoning changes cannot be detrimental to the public health and safety calling out the following testimony: "Three of the five councilmembers who voted to deny the application explicitly cited public health and safety as the basis for their decisions:

1. Councilmember Skorman: "I can't support this kind of a dense project right now in our WUI for health and safety reasons."

2. Councilmember Dave Donelson: "One of the criteria we must base our decisions on is that it is not detrimental to public health and safety [T]his isn't just another infill site . . . it's one with a real history . . . [a]nd the real history is we had a big fire here not long ago right next to it."
3. President Strand: "[O]ne of the criteria is health and safety. . . . I'm going to keep my foot on the pedal as best as I can to make sure that we keep our promises to our City to keep everybody safe."

Ms. Chalfin asked you, "This also plays into the development question, right? And you know, you've talked a lot about responsible growth and in terms of high density development, mixed use and so forth, there are a number of proposals in some of our most at-risk areas. And I'm wondering how you feel about developments on the west side, for instance, where it is some of the most at-risk areas."

You responded, "...Now let's talk about [24-24](#). Yeah, I'm an economic developer. I'm for growth that is responsible. I am for growth that is sustainable. I am for growth that is intelligent. I do want to see us tackle our affordable housing project. I do want to see development. I do want to see info, I do want to see density cuz that's how we solve those problems. **But in this issue, the residents have spoken**, they have voiced their concern that maybe the time is not now. Maybe we need to look at a different pocket of the city for that development. And so as mayor, that was one of those areas, the 24-24 project that I believe demands the mayor's attention, demands the mayor's visibility. The mayor needs to show up. And that's an opportunity where I will be leaning into."

Will you be fulfilling your campaign promise that you need to show up and protect the citizens who clearly heard this and voted for you thinking you would protect their public safety?

In addition to your campaign promise regarding development at this dangerous chokepoint, below is a concise list of reasons to stand-up and tell your planning department both the courts and the people have spoken:

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.5.603.B.1 of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not approve this project.
2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. However, in fact, the Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and it's decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.
3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.
4. On 3/20/23, a Neighborhood meeting with the City's OEM and Police at the Fire Station #18 was held to discuss evacuation planning. The OEM/police disclosed that their method of traffic management for an evacuation is decided in a meeting where attendees provided their personal ideas. They do not use, nor are

they authorized to use modeling tools, such as those used by FEMA which show where traffic choke-points will occur and the optimal locations for contraflow. The 2012 Waldo Fire was the worst fire in Colorado's history – so bad that the President of the U.S. visited the Mountain Shadows Community, the heart of the fire which burned 347 homes to the ground, killed two people, damaged hundreds of other homes, evacuated over 32,000 people, and caused “a devastating blow to our collective sense of safety and security” (RE: <https://www.cspm.org/cos-150-story/waldo-canyon-and-black-forest-fires/>). A photo from the Waldo fire was presented to City Council during the 2424 Project, taken from I-25 looking west over Woodmen Rd at the intersection of Corporate Dr. This was the merge point at the end of the contraflow. The photo shows 2 lanes of contraflow from the west along with 3 lanes of normal flow from the west. Traffic management had to alternate stopping the two outbound flows in order to merge the contraflow traffic back onto the normal eastbound lanes. According to evidence gathered by the Mountain Shadows Action Team from interviewing residents along Woodmen Rd, the alternate stopping of the traffic caused a 2.7 mile backup, to at least, the entrance of the Peregrine subdivision. Additionally, the neighbors said that the traffic was so bad that traffic from secondary roads could not enter onto Woodmen Rd. – these are known as choke-points. When this information was conveyed to the OEM/Police during the Neighborhood meeting, the response was; “We know we could have done better”. Without the proper modeling tools to help OEM/Police to scientifically identify choke-points and contraflow locations, along with at least a 15% growth since the 2012 Waldo fire, evacuation conditions have been exacerbated making it even more detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. Under 7.5.603.B.1, this project does not meet the criteria to rezone. The city planner must stop this project.

The city planner's first and foremost responsibility is to uphold city code. As demonstrated in this document, there are an overwhelming number of violations that are justifiable in stopping the Arrowswest development. Will you be telling the city planner that they cannot approve this project because of the public threat to your constituents as you campaigned you would do?

As a special educator in a local public school, I am also concerned about this area's ability to support an influx of families with school-aged children. Our schools are already under staffed in all positions. In addition to all the issues raised above, we cannot educationally support a large number of new children to the area. Have you considered the impact a housing development would have on local schools? Please do. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Caroline Abourezk

3. **Rhonda Wittwer**
April 3, 2024

Dear Mayor Mobolade,

During your campaign, you were [interviewed by Andrea Chalfin with KRCC](#) in which she asked about the 2424 development on Garden of the Gods which City Council denied due to public safety risks, and the courts upheld that decision noting the testimony by Councilmembers that show development at that location violates 7.5.603.B that zoning changes cannot be detrimental to the public health and safety calling out the following testimony:

"Three of the five councilmembers who voted to deny the application explicitly cited public health and safety as the basis for their decisions:

1. Councilmember Skorman: "I can't support this kind of a dense project right now in our WUI for health and safety reasons."
2. Councilmember Dave Donelson: "One of the criteria we must base our decisions on is that it is not detrimental to public health and safety [T]his isn't just another infill site . . . it's one with a real history . . . [a]nd the real history is we had a big fire here not long ago right next to it."

3. President Strand: "[O]ne of the criteria is health and safety. . . . I'm going to keep my foot on the pedal as best as I can to make sure that we keep our promises to our City to keep everybody safe."

Ms. Chalfin asked you, "This also plays into the development question, right? And you know, you've talked a lot about responsible growth and in terms of high density development, mixed use and so forth, there are a number of proposals in some of our most at-risk areas. And I'm wondering how you feel about developments on the west side, for instance, where it is some of the most at-risk areas."

You responded, "...Now let's talk about 24-24. Yeah, I'm an economic developer. I'm for growth that is responsible. I am for growth that is sustainable. I am for growth that is intelligent. I do want to see us tackle our affordable housing project. I do want to see development. I do want to see info, I do want to see density cuz that's how we solve those problems. **But in this issue, the residents have spoken**, they have voiced their concern that maybe the time is not now. Maybe we need to look at a different pocket of the city for that development. And so as mayor, that was one of those areas, the 24-24 project that I believe demands the mayor's attention, demands the mayor's visibility. The mayor needs to show up. And that's an opportunity where I will be leaning into."

Will you be fulfilling your campaign promise that you need to show up and protect the citizens who clearly heard this and voted for you thinking you would protect their public safety?

In addition to your campaign promise regarding development at this dangerous chokepoint, below is a concise list of reasons to stand-up and tell your planning department both the courts and the people have spoken:

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.5.603.B.1 of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not approve this project.
2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. However, in fact, the Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and it's decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.
3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.
4. On 3/20/23, a Neighborhood meeting with the City's OEM and Police at the Fire Station #18 was held to discuss evacuation planning. The OEM/police disclosed that their method of traffic management for an evacuation is decided in a meeting where attendees provided their personal ideas. They do not use, nor are they authorized to use modeling tools, such as those used by FEMA which show where traffic chokepoints will occur and the optimal locations for contraflow. The 2012 Waldo Fire was the worst fire in Colorado's history – so bad that the President of the U.S. visited the Mountain Shadows Community, the heart of the fire which burned 347 homes to the ground, killed two people, damaged hundreds of other homes, evacuated over 32,000 people, and caused "a devastating blow to our collective sense of safety and security" (RE: <https://www.cspm.org/cos-150-story/waldo-canyon-and-black-forest-fires/>). A photo from the Waldo fire was presented to City Council during the 2424 Project, taken from I-25 looking west over Woodmen Rd at the intersection of Corporate Dr. This was the merge point at the end of the contraflow. The photo shows 2 lanes

of contraflow from the west along with 3 lanes of normal flow from the west. Traffic management had to alternate stopping the two outbound flows in order to merge the contraflow traffic back onto the normal eastbound lanes. According to evidence gathered by the Mountain Shadows Action Team from interviewing residents along Woodmen Rd, the alternate stopping of the traffic caused a 2.7 mile backup, to at least, the entrance of the Peregrine subdivision. Additionally, the neighbors said that the traffic was so bad that traffic from secondary roads could not enter onto Woodmen Rd. – these are known as chokepoints. When this information was conveyed to the OEM/Police during the Neighborhood meeting, the response was; “We know we could have done better”. Without the proper modeling tools to help OEM/Police to scientifically identify chokepoints and contraflow locations, along with at least a 15% growth since the 2012 Waldo fire, evacuation conditions have been exacerbated making it even more detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. Under 7.5.603.B.1, this project does not meet the criteria to rezone. The city planner must stop this project.

The city planner’s first and foremost responsibility is to uphold city code. As demonstrated in this document, there are an overwhelming number of violations that are justifiable in stopping the Arrowswest development. Will you be telling the city planner that they cannot approve this project because of the public threat to your constituents as you campaigned you would do?

Sincerely,
Rhonda Wittwer

4. **Tom Baker Sr.**
April 5, 2024

Dear Mayor Mobolade,

I voted for you because I believed in you.

During your campaign, you were [interviewed by Andrea Chalfin with KRCC](#) in which she asked about the 2424 development on Garden of the Gods which City Council denied due to public safety risks, and the courts upheld that decision noting the testimony by Councilmembers that show development at that location violates 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) that zoning changes cannot be detrimental to the public health and safety calling out the following testimony:

"Three of the five councilmembers who voted to deny the application explicitly cited public health and safety as the basis for their decisions:

1. Councilmember Skorman: “I can’t support this kind of a dense project right now in our WUI for health and safety reasons.”

2. Councilmember Dave Donelson: “One of the criteria we must base our decisions on is that it is not detrimental to public health and safety . . . [T]his isn’t just another infill site . . . it’s one with a real history . . . [a]nd the real history is we had a big fire here not long ago right next to it.”

3. President Strand: “[O]ne of the criteria is health and safety. . . . I’m going to keep my foot on the pedal as best as I can to make sure that we keep our promises to our City to keep everybody safe.”

Ms. Chalfin asked you, “This also plays into the development question, right? And you know, you’ve talked a lot about responsible growth and in terms of high density development, mixed use and so forth, there are a number of proposals in some of our most at-risk areas. And I’m wondering how you feel about developments on the west side, for instance, where it is some of the most at-risk areas.”

You responded, “...Now let’s talk about [24-24](#). Yeah, I’m an economic developer. I’m for growth that is responsible. I am for growth that is sustainable. I am for growth that is intelligent. I do want to see us tackle our affordable housing project. I do want to see development. I do want to see info, I do want to see density cuz that’s how we solve those problems. **But in this issue, the residents have spoken**, they have voiced their concern that maybe the time is not now. Maybe we need to look at a different pocket of the city for that development. And so as mayor, that was one of those areas, the 24-24 project that I believe demands the

mayor's attention, demands the mayor's visibility. The mayor needs to show up. And that's an opportunity where I will be leaning into."

Will you be fulfilling your campaign promise that you need to show up and protect the citizens who clearly heard this and voted for you thinking you would protect their public safety?

In addition to your campaign promise regarding development at this dangerous chokepoint, below is a concise list of reasons to stand-up and tell your planning department both the courts and the people have spoken:

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not approve this project.
2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. However, in fact, the Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and its decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.
3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.
4. On 3/20/23, a Neighborhood meeting with the City's OEM and Police at the Fire Station #18 was held to discuss evacuation planning. The OEM/police disclosed that their method of traffic management for an evacuation is decided in a meeting where attendees provided their personal ideas. They do not use, nor are they authorized to use modeling tools, such as those used by FEMA which show where traffic chokepoints will occur and the optimal locations for contraflow. The 2012 Waldo Fire was the worst fire in Colorado's history – so bad that the President of the U.S. visited the Mountain Shadows Community, the heart of the fire which burned 347 homes to the ground, killed two people, damaged hundreds of other homes, evacuated over 32,000 people, and caused "a devastating blow to our collective sense of safety and security" (RE: <https://www.cspm.org/cos-150-story/waldo-canyon-and-black-forest-fires/>). A photo from the Waldo fire was presented to City Council during the 2424 Project, taken from I-25 looking west over Woodmen Rd at the intersection of Corporate Dr. This was the merge point at the end of the contraflow. The photo shows 2 lanes of contraflow from the west along with 3 lanes of normal flow from the west. Traffic management had to alternate stopping the two outbound flows in order to merge the contraflow traffic back onto the normal eastbound lanes. According to evidence gathered by the Mountain Shadows Action Team from interviewing residents along Woodmen Rd, the alternate stopping of the traffic caused a 2.7 mile backup, to at least, the entrance of the Peregrine subdivision. Additionally, the neighbors said that the traffic was so bad that traffic from secondary roads could not enter onto Woodmen Rd. – these are known as chokepoints. When this information was conveyed to the OEM/Police during the Neighborhood meeting, the response was; "We know we could have done better". Without the proper modeling tools to help OEM/Police to scientifically identify chokepoints and contraflow locations, along with at least a 15% growth since the 2012 Waldo fire, evacuation conditions have been exacerbated making it even more detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. Under 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B), this project does not meet the criteria to rezone. The city planner must stop this project.

The city planner's first and foremost responsibility is to uphold city code. As demonstrated in this document, there are an overwhelming number of violations that are justifiable in stopping the Arrowswest development. Will you be telling the city planner that they cannot approve this project because of the public threat to your constituents as you campaigned you would do?

Sincerely,
Thomas Baker
He is Risen!

5. **Ted Esker**
April 6, 2024

Why would the city approve an apartment complex across the street from the same place at 2424 one was rejected? Uphold the opinion of the public and don't let your opinion be bought by these developers.

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly 7.5.603.B.1) of the rezone criteria.. The city planner should not have approved this project and the Planning Commission should not either.

2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. The Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and it's decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.

3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.

Thank you,
Ted Esker

6. **Karol Christie**
April 6, 2024

Dear Mr. Gray and City Planning team,

I love Colorado Springs! Thank you for your work in making it an amazing city.

I do want to comment on the zoning request for Arrowswest Apartments on Garden of the Gods Road near 30th Street and Red Leg Brewery.

Our family lives in Mountain Shadows, and we were evacuated during the Waldo Canyon Fire. The terrifying time then for everyone who was involved should give a huge pause—or better yet, a STOP—to considering a 222-unit multi-family complex to be built at a significant chokepoint.

In addition to the above, a more critical reason NOT to approve this new zoning request is that the City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly 7.5.603.B.1) of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not have approved this project, and the Planning Commission should not either.

Two additional reasons:

2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. The Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and it's decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.

3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.

PLEASE consider the welfare of the people of this great city instead of corporate/developer interests. You owe it to yourself to be honest and do what is best for the citizens.

Sincerely,

Karol Christie
Mountain Shadows resident

7. **Karla Warneke**
April 6, 2024

I live in Mountain Shadows and I live here because of the open spaces. Please do not approve this. STOP filling up the West side please.

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly 7.5.603.B.1) of the rezone criteria.. The city planner should not have approved this project and the Planning Commission should not either.
2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. The Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and it's decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.
3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.

Thank you,
Karla W.

8. **Karen Recktenwald**
April 9, 2024

Dear Mr. Gray and City Planning team,

I love Colorado Springs! Thank you for your work in making it an amazing city.

I do want to comment on the zoning request for Arrowswest Apartments on Garden of the Gods Road near 30th Street and Red Leg Brewery.

Our family lives in Mountain Shadows, and we were evacuated during the Waldo Canyon Fire. The terrifying time then for everyone who was involved should give a huge pause—or better yet, a STOP—to considering a 222-unit multi-family complex to be built at a significant chokepoint.

In addition to the above, a more critical reason NOT to approve this new zoning request is that the City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of

Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly 7.5.603.B.1) of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not have approved this project, and the Planning Commission should not either.

Two additional reasons:

2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. The Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and it's decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.

3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.

PLEASE consider the welfare of the people of this great city instead of corporate/developer interests. You owe it to yourself to be honest and do what is best for the city and us, it's citizens.

Sincerely,

Karen Recktenwald
Mountain Shadows resident since 2012

9. **Madeleine Bucher**
April 9, 2024

Hi Bill,

I imagine you've received a number of Mountain Shadows neighbor complaints about the rezone application for the Arrowswest Apartments project. Brian and I live in Mountain Shadows and we've seen the emails from the community association. I don't believe in a blanket approach against development and new housing projects. I'm writing because I don't see an obvious reason to be against this project.

In looking at the documents for the proposed rezone, it doesn't seem like the applicant is requesting anything outrageous. Neighboring properties are already zoned MX-M, so this rezone would not drastically change the neighborhood. Adding apartments close to businesses seems to make sense as well... provide easy commute options and affordable living arrangements for folks. I would guess Red Leg Brewing wouldn't be opposed to having more people be able to walk to their brewery.

As to the concerns about evacuating in the event of a wildfire, odds are against this for the next couple decades (everything already burned in the Waldo Canyon fire). Plus, I believe a traffic study will be required when the project goes through the DP process and that would bring to light any congestion concerns.

I know this isn't a popular opinion for Mountain Shadows and I'll probably get some backlash for speaking my mind here. I think the development deserves a fair shot at being heard and allow them the chance to show how the apartment complex could help the community.

Regards,
Madeleine

10. **Cynthia Hurwitz**
April 9, 2024

Dear Mayor Mobolade,

During your campaign, you were [interviewed by Andrea Chalfin with KRCC](#) in which she asked about the 2424 development on Garden of the Gods which City Council denied due to public safety risks, and the courts upheld that decision noting the testimony by Councilmembers that show development at that location violates 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) that zoning changes cannot be detrimental to the public health and safety calling out the following testimony:

"Three of the five councilmembers who voted to deny the application explicitly cited public health and safety as the basis for their decisions:

1. Councilmember Skorman: "I can't support this kind of a dense project right now in our WUI for health and safety reasons."

2. Councilmember Dave Donelson: "One of the criteria we must base our decisions on is that it is not detrimental to public health and safety . . . [T]his isn't just another infill site . . . it's one with a real history . . . [a]nd the real history is we had a big fire here not long ago right next to it."

3. President Strand: "[O]ne of the criteria is health and safety. . . . I'm going to keep my foot on the pedal as best as I can to make sure that we keep our promises to our City to keep everybody safe."

Ms. Chalfin asked you, "This also plays into the development question, right? And you know, you've talked a lot about responsible growth and in terms of high density development, mixed use and so forth, there are a number of proposals in some of our most at-risk areas. And I'm wondering how you feel about developments on the west side, for instance, where it is some of the most at-risk areas."

You responded, "...Now let's talk about [24-24](#). Yeah, I'm an economic developer. I'm for growth that is responsible. I am for growth that is sustainable. I am for growth that is intelligent. I do want to see us tackle our affordable housing project. I do want to see development. I do want to see info, I do want to see density cuz that's how we solve those problems. **But in this issue, the residents have spoken**, they have voiced their concern that maybe the time is not now. Maybe we need to look at a different pocket of the city for that development. And so as mayor, that was one of those areas, the 24-24 project that I believe demands the mayor's attention, demands the mayor's visibility. The mayor needs to show up. And that's an opportunity where I will be leaning into."

Will you be fulfilling your campaign promise that you need to show up and protect the citizens who clearly heard this and voted for you thinking you would protect their public safety?

In addition to your campaign promise regarding development at this dangerous chokepoint, below is a concise list of reasons to stand-up and tell your planning department both the courts and the people have spoken:

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not approve this project.

2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. However, in fact, the Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and it's decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.

3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.

4. On 3/20/23, a Neighborhood meeting with the City's OEM and Police at the Fire Station #18 was held to discuss evacuation planning. The OEM/police disclosed that their method of traffic management for an evacuation is decided in a meeting where attendees provided their personal ideas. They do not use, nor are they authorized to use modeling tools, such as those used by FEMA which show where traffic chokepoints will occur and the optimal locations for contraflow. The 2012 Waldo Fire was the worst fire in Colorado's history – so bad that the President of the U.S. visited the Mountain Shadows Community, the heart of the fire which burned 347 homes to the ground, killed two people, damaged hundreds of other homes, evacuated over 32,000 people, and caused “a devastating blow to our collective sense of safety and security” (RE: <https://www.cspm.org/cos-150-story/waldo-canyon-and-black-forest-fires/>). A photo from the Waldo fire was presented to City Council during the 2424 Project, taken from I-25 looking west over Woodmen Rd at the intersection of Corporate Dr. This was the merge point at the end of the contraflow. The photo shows 2 lanes of contraflow from the west along with 3 lanes of normal flow from the west. Traffic management had to alternate stopping the two outbound flows in order to merge the contraflow traffic back onto the normal eastbound lanes. According to evidence gathered by the Mountain Shadows Action Team from interviewing residents along Woodmen Rd, the alternate stopping of the traffic caused a 2.7 mile backup, to at least, the entrance of the Peregrine subdivision. Additionally, the neighbors said that the traffic was so bad that traffic from secondary roads could not enter onto Woodmen Rd. – these are known as chokepoints. When this information was conveyed to the OEM/Police during the Neighborhood meeting, the response was; “We know we could have done better”. Without the proper modeling tools to help OEM/Police to scientifically identify chokepoints and contraflow locations, along with at least a 15% growth since the 2012 Waldo fire, evacuation conditions have been exacerbated making it even more detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. Under 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B), this project does not meet the criteria to rezone. The city planner must stop this project.

The city planner's first and foremost responsibility is to uphold city code. As demonstrated in this document, there are an overwhelming number of violations that are justifiable in stopping the Arrowswest development. Will you be telling the city planner that they cannot approve this project because of the public threat to your constituents as you campaigned you would do?

Sincerely,
Cynthia Hurwitz

Dear Mayor Mobolade,

During your campaign, you were interviewed by Andrea Chalfin with KRCC in which she asked about the 2424 development on Garden of the Gods which City Council denied due to public safety risks, and the courts upheld that decision noting the testimony by Councilmembers that show development at that location violates 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) that zoning changes cannot be detrimental to the public health and safety calling out the following testimony:

"Three of the five councilmembers who voted to deny the application explicitly cited public health and safety as the basis for their decisions:

1. Councilmember Skorman: "I can't support this kind of a dense project right now in our WUI for health and safety reasons."
2. Councilmember Dave Donelson: "One of the criteria we must base our decisions on is that it is not detrimental to public health and safety . . . [T]his isn't just another infill site . . . it's one with a real history . . . [a]nd the real history is we had a big fire here not long ago right next to it."
3. President Strand: "[O]ne of the criteria is health and safety. . . . I'm going to keep my foot on the pedal as best as I can to make sure that we keep our promises to our City to keep everybody safe."

Ms. Chalfin asked you, "This also plays into the development question, right? And you know, you've talked a lot about responsible growth and in terms of high density development, mixed use and so forth, there are a number of proposals in some of our most at-risk areas. And I'm wondering how you feel about developments on the west side, for instance, where it is some of the most at-risk areas."

You responded, "...Now let's talk about 24-24. Yeah, I'm an economic developer. I'm for growth that is responsible. I am for growth that is sustainable. I am for growth that is intelligent. I do want to see us tackle our affordable housing project. I do want to see development. I do want to see info, I do want to see density cuz that's how we solve those problems. But in this issue, the residents have spoken, they have voiced their concern that maybe the time is not now. Maybe we need to look at a different pocket of the city for that development. And so as mayor, that was one of those areas, the 24-24 project that I believe demands the mayor's attention, demands the mayor's visibility. The mayor needs to show up. And that's an opportunity where I will be leaning into."

Will you be fulfilling your campaign promise that you need to show up and protect the citizens who clearly heard this and voted for you thinking you would protect their public safety?

In addition to your campaign promise regarding development at this dangerous chokepoint, below is a concise list of reasons to stand-up and tell your planning department both the courts and the people have spoken:

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not approve this project.

2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. However, in fact, the Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and it's decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.

3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.

4. On 3/20/23, a Neighborhood meeting with the City's OEM and Police at the Fire Station #18 was held to discuss evacuation planning. The OEM/police disclosed that their method of traffic management for an evacuation is decided in a meeting where attendees provided their personal ideas. They do not use, nor are they authorized to use modeling tools, such as those used by FEMA which show where traffic chokepoints will occur and the optimal locations for contraflow. The 2012 Waldo Fire was the worst fire in Colorado's history – so bad that the President of the U.S. visited the Mountain Shadows Community, the heart of the fire which burned 347 homes to the ground, killed two people, damaged hundreds of other homes, evacuated over 32,000 people, and caused “a devastating blow to our collective sense of safety and security” (RE: <https://www.cspm.org/cos-150-story/waldo-canyon-and-black-forest-fires/>). A photo from the Waldo fire was presented to City Council during the 2424 Project, taken from I-25 looking west over Woodmen Rd at the intersection of Corporate Dr. This was the merge point at the end of the contraflow. The photo shows 2 lanes of contraflow from the west along with 3 lanes of normal flow from the west. Traffic management had to alternate stopping the two outbound flows in order to merge the contraflow traffic back onto the normal eastbound lanes. According to evidence gathered by the Mountain Shadows Action Team from interviewing residents along Woodmen Rd, the alternate stopping of the traffic caused a 2.7 mile backup, to at least, the entrance of the Peregrine subdivision. Additionally, the neighbors said that the traffic was so bad that traffic from secondary roads could not enter onto Woodmen Rd. – these are known as chokepoints. When this information was conveyed to the OEM/Police during the Neighborhood meeting, the response was; “We know we could have done better”. Without the proper modeling tools to help OEM/Police to scientifically identify chokepoints and contraflow locations, along with at least a 15% growth since the 2012 Waldo fire, evacuation conditions have been exacerbated making it even more detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. Under 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B), this project does not meet the criteria to rezone. The city planner must stop this project.

The city planner's first and foremost responsibility is to uphold city code. As demonstrated in this document, there are an overwhelming number of violations that are justifiable in stopping the Arrowswest development. Will you be telling the city planner that they cannot approve this project because of the public threat to your constituents as you campaigned you would do?

Sincerely,

Alicia Netherton

Mountain Shadows Resident since 1989 & 2nd Generation Colorado Springs Native

12. **Nathaniel Gambles**

April 9, 2024

Dear Mayor Mobolade,

During your campaign, you were interviewed by Andrea Chalfin with KRCC in which she asked about the 2424 development on Garden of the Gods which City Council denied due to public safety risks, and the courts upheld that decision noting the testimony by Councilmembers that show development at that location violates 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) that zoning changes cannot be detrimental to the public health and safety calling out the following testimony:

"Three of the five councilmembers who voted to deny the application explicitly cited public health and safety as the basis for their decisions:

1. Councilmember Skorman: "I can't support this kind of a dense project right now in our WUI for health and safety reasons."

2. Councilmember Dave Donelson: "One of the criteria we must base our decisions on is that it is not detrimental to public health and safety . . . [T]his isn't just another infill site . . . it's one with a real history . . . [a]nd the real history is we had a big fire here not long ago right next to it."

3. President Strand: "[O]ne of the criteria is health and safety. . . . I'm going to keep my foot on the pedal as best as I can to make sure that we keep our promises to our City to keep everybody safe."

Ms. Chalfin asked you, "This also plays into the development question, right? And you know, you've talked a lot about responsible growth and in terms of high density development, mixed use and so forth, there are a number of proposals in some of our most at-risk areas. And I'm wondering how you feel about developments on the west side, for instance, where it is some of the most at-risk areas."

You responded, "...Now let's talk about 24-24. Yeah, I'm an economic developer. I'm for growth that is responsible. I am for growth that is sustainable. I am for growth that is intelligent. I do want to see us tackle our affordable housing project. I do want to see development. I do want to see info, I do want to see density cuz that's how we solve those problems. But in this issue, the residents have spoken, they have voiced their concern that maybe the time is not now. Maybe we need to look at a different pocket of the city for that development. And so as mayor, that was one of those areas, the 24-24 project that I believe demands the mayor's attention, demands the mayor's visibility. The mayor needs to show up. And that's an opportunity where I will be leaning into."

Will you be fulfilling your campaign promise that you need to show up and protect the citizens who clearly heard this and voted for you thinking you would protect their public safety?

In addition to your campaign promise regarding development at this dangerous chokepoint, below is a concise list of reasons to stand-up and tell your planning department both the courts and the people have spoken:

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not approve this project.
2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. However, in fact, the Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and its decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.
3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.
4. On 3/20/23, a Neighborhood meeting with the City's OEM and Police at the Fire Station #18 was held to discuss evacuation planning. The OEM/police disclosed that their method of traffic management for an evacuation is decided in a meeting where attendees provided their personal ideas. They do not use, nor are they authorized to use modeling tools, such as those used by FEMA which show where traffic chokepoints will occur and the optimal locations for contraflow. The 2012 Waldo Fire was the worst fire in Colorado's history – so bad that the President of the U.S. visited the Mountain Shadows Community, the heart of the fire which burned 347 homes to the ground, killed two people, damaged hundreds of other homes, evacuated over 32,000 people, and caused “a devastating blow to our collective sense of safety and security” (RE: <https://www.cspm.org/cos-150-story/waldo-canyon-and-black-forest-fires/>). A photo from the Waldo fire was presented to City Council during the 2424 Project, taken from I-25 looking west over Woodmen Rd at the intersection of Corporate Dr. This was the merge point at the end of the contraflow. The photo shows 2 lanes of contraflow from the west along with 3 lanes of normal flow from the west. Traffic management had to alternate stopping the two outbound flows in order to merge the contraflow traffic back onto the normal eastbound lanes. According to evidence gathered by the Mountain Shadows Action Team from interviewing residents along Woodmen Rd, the alternate stopping of the traffic caused a 2.7 mile backup, to at least, the entrance of the Peregrine subdivision. Additionally, the neighbors said that the traffic was so bad that traffic from secondary roads could not enter onto Woodmen Rd. – these are known as chokepoints. When this information was conveyed to the OEM/Police during the Neighborhood meeting, the response was; “We know we could have done better”. Without the proper modeling tools to help OEM/Police to scientifically identify chokepoints and contraflow locations, along with at least a 15% growth since the 2012 Waldo fire, evacuation conditions have been exacerbated making it even more detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. Under 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B), this project does not meet the criteria to rezone. The city planner must stop this project.

The city planner's first and foremost responsibility is to uphold city code. As demonstrated in this document, there are an overwhelming number of violations that are justifiable in stopping the Arrowswest development. Will you be telling the city planner that they cannot approve this project because of the public threat to your constituents as you campaigned you would do?

Sincerely,

Nathaniel Gambles
Mountain Shadows Resident

13. **Leslie Rogers**
April 12, 2024

Dear Mayor Mobolade,

During your campaign, you were [interviewed by Andrea Chalfin with KRCC](#) in which she asked about the 2424 development on Garden of the Gods which City Council denied due to public safety risks, and the courts upheld that decision noting the testimony by Councilmembers that show development at that location violates 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) that zoning changes cannot be detrimental to the public health and safety calling out the following testimony:

"Three of the five councilmembers who voted to deny the application explicitly cited public health and safety as the basis for their decisions:

1. Councilmember Skorman: "I can't support this kind of a dense project right now in our WUI for health and safety reasons."
2. Councilmember Dave Donelson: "One of the criteria we must base our decisions on is that it is not detrimental to public health and safety . . . [T]his isn't just another infill site . . . it's one with a real history . . . [a]nd the real history is we had a big fire here not long ago right next to it."
3. President Strand: "[O]ne of the criteria is health and safety. . . . I'm going to keep my foot on the pedal as best as I can to make sure that we keep our promises to our City to keep everybody safe."

Ms. Chalfin asked you, "This also plays into the development question, right? And you know, you've talked a lot about responsible growth and in terms of high density development, mixed use and so forth, there are a number of proposals in some of our most at-risk areas. And I'm wondering how you feel about developments on the west side, for instance, where it is some of the most at-risk areas."

You responded, "...Now let's talk about [24-24](#). Yeah, I'm an economic developer. I'm for growth that is responsible. I am for growth that is sustainable. I am for growth that is intelligent. I do want to see us tackle our affordable housing project. I do want to see development. I do want to see info, I do want to see density cuz that's how we solve those problems. **But in this issue, the residents have spoken**, they have voiced their concern that maybe the time is not now. Maybe we need to look at a different pocket of the city for that development. And so as mayor, that was one of those areas, the 24-24 project that I believe demands the mayor's attention, demands the mayor's visibility. The mayor needs to show up. And that's an opportunity where I will be leaning into."

Will you be fulfilling your campaign promise that you need to show up and protect the citizens who clearly heard this and voted for you thinking you would protect their public safety?

In addition to your campaign promise regarding development at this dangerous chokepoint, below is a concise list of reasons to stand-up and tell your planning department both the courts and the people have spoken:

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not approve this project.
2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. However, in fact, the Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and its decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.
3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.
4. On 3/20/23, a Neighborhood meeting with the City's OEM and Police at the Fire Station #18 was held to discuss evacuation planning. The OEM/police disclosed that their method of traffic management for an evacuation is decided in a meeting where attendees provided their personal ideas. They do not use, nor are they authorized to use modeling tools, such as those used by FEMA which show where traffic chokepoints will occur and the optimal locations for contraflow. The 2012 Waldo Fire was the worst fire in Colorado's history – so bad that the President of the U.S. visited the Mountain Shadows Community, the heart of the fire which burned 347 homes to the ground, killed two people, damaged hundreds of other homes, evacuated over 32,000 people, and caused “a devastating blow to our collective sense of safety and security” (RE: <https://www.cspm.org/cos-150-story/waldo-canyon-and-black-forest-fires/>). A photo from the Waldo fire was presented to City Council during the 2424 Project, taken from I-25 looking west over Woodmen Rd at the intersection of Corporate Dr. This was the merge point at the end of the contraflow. The photo shows 2 lanes of contraflow from the west along with 3 lanes of normal flow from the west. Traffic management had to alternate stopping the two outbound flows in order to merge the contraflow traffic back onto the normal eastbound lanes. According to evidence gathered by the Mountain Shadows Action Team from interviewing residents along Woodmen Rd, the alternate stopping of the traffic caused a 2.7 mile backup, to at least, the entrance of the Peregrine subdivision. Additionally, the neighbors said that the traffic was so bad that traffic from secondary roads could not enter onto Woodmen Rd. – these are known as chokepoints. When this information was conveyed to the OEM/Police during the Neighborhood meeting, the response was; “We know we could have done better”. Without the proper modeling tools to help OEM/Police to scientifically identify chokepoints and contraflow locations, along with at least a 15% growth since the 2012 Waldo fire, evacuation conditions have been exacerbated making it even more detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. Under 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B), this project does not meet the criteria to rezone. The city planner must stop this project.

The city planner's first and foremost responsibility is to uphold city code. As demonstrated in this document, there are an overwhelming number of violations that are justifiable in stopping the Arrowswest development. Will you be telling the city planner that they cannot approve this project because of the public threat to your constituents as you campaigned you would do?

Sincerely,
Leslie Rogers

14. **Tracy Auger**
April 12, 2024

Dear Mayor Mobolade,

During your campaign, you were [interviewed by Andrea Chalfin with KRCC](#) in which she asked about the 2424 development on Garden of the Gods which City Council denied due to public safety risks, and the courts upheld that decision noting the testimony by Councilmembers that show development at that location violates 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) that zoning changes cannot be detrimental to the public health and safety calling out the following testimony:

"Three of the five councilmembers who voted to deny the application explicitly cited public health and safety as the basis for their decisions:

1. Councilmember Skorman: "I can't support this kind of a dense project right now in our WUI for health and safety reasons."

2. Councilmember Dave Donelson: "One of the criteria we must base our decisions on is that it is not detrimental to public health and safety . . . [T]his isn't just another infill site . . . it's one with a real history . . . [a]nd the real history is we had a big fire here not long ago right next to it."

3. President Strand: "[O]ne of the criteria is health and safety. . . . I'm going to keep my foot on the pedal as best as I can to make sure that we keep our promises to our City to keep everybody safe."

Ms. Chalfin asked you, "This also plays into the development question, right? And you know, you've talked a lot about responsible growth and in terms of high density development, mixed use and so forth, there are a number of proposals in some of our most at-risk areas. And I'm wondering how you feel about developments on the west side, for instance, where it is some of the most at-risk areas."

You responded, "...Now let's talk about [24-24](#). Yeah, I'm an economic developer. I'm for growth that is responsible. I am for growth that is sustainable. I am for growth that is intelligent. I do want to see us tackle our affordable housing project. I do want to see development. I do want to see info, I do want to see density cuz that's how we solve those problems. **But in this issue, the residents have spoken**, they have voiced their concern that maybe the time is not now. Maybe we need to look at a different pocket of the city for that development. And so as mayor, that was one of those areas, the 24-24 project that I believe demands the mayor's attention, demands the mayor's visibility. The mayor needs to show up. And that's an opportunity where I will be leaning into."

Will you be fulfilling your campaign promise that you need to show up and protect the citizens who clearly heard this and voted for you thinking you would protect their public safety?

In addition to your campaign promise regarding development at this dangerous chokepoint, below is a concise list of reasons to stand-up and tell your planning department both the courts and the people have spoken:

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not approve this project.

2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. However, in fact, the Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and its decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.

3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.

4. On 3/20/23, a Neighborhood meeting with the City's OEM and Police at the Fire Station #18 was held to discuss evacuation planning. The OEM/police disclosed that their method of traffic management for an evacuation is decided in a meeting where attendees provided their personal ideas. They do not use, nor are they authorized to use modeling tools, such as those used by FEMA which show where traffic chokepoints will occur and the optimal locations for contraflow. The 2012 Waldo Fire was the worst fire in Colorado's history – so bad that the President of the U.S. visited the Mountain Shadows Community, the heart of the fire which burned 347 homes to the ground, killed two people, damaged hundreds of other homes, evacuated over 32,000 people, and caused "a devastating blow to our collective sense of safety and security" (RE: <https://www.cspm.org/cos-150-story/waldo-canyon-and-black-forest-fires/>). A photo from the Waldo fire was presented to City Council during the 2424 Project, taken from I-25 looking west over Woodmen Rd at the intersection of Corporate Dr. This was the merge point at the end of the contraflow. The photo shows 2 lanes of contraflow from the west along with 3 lanes of normal flow from the west. Traffic management had to alternate stopping the two outbound flows in order to merge the contraflow traffic back onto the normal eastbound lanes. According to evidence gathered by the Mountain Shadows Action Team from interviewing residents along Woodmen Rd, the alternate stopping of the traffic caused a 2.7 mile backup, to at least, the entrance of the Peregrine subdivision. Additionally, the neighbors said that the traffic was so bad that traffic from secondary roads could not enter onto Woodmen Rd. – these are known as chokepoints. When this information was conveyed to the OEM/Police during the Neighborhood meeting, the response was; "We know we could have done better". Without the proper modeling tools to help OEM/Police to scientifically identify chokepoints and contraflow locations, along with at least a 15% growth since the 2012 Waldo fire, evacuation conditions have been exacerbated making it even more detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. Under 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B), this project does not meet the criteria to rezone. The city planner must stop this project.

The city planner's first and foremost responsibility is to uphold city code. As demonstrated in this document, there are an overwhelming number of violations that are justifiable in stopping the Arrowswest development. Will you be telling the city planner that they cannot approve this project because of the public threat to your constituents as you campaigned you would do?

Sincerely,

Tracy Auger

"Be kinder than necessary for everyone you meet is fighting some kind of battle."

15. **Leslie Jonas**
April 12, 2024

Dear Mayor Mobolade,

During your campaign, you were [interviewed by Andrea Chalfin with KRCC](#) in which she asked about the 2424 development on Garden of the Gods which City Council denied due to public safety risks, and the courts upheld that decision noting the testimony by Councilmembers that show development at that location violates

7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) that zoning changes cannot be detrimental to the public health and safety calling out the following testimony:

"Three of the five councilmembers who voted to deny the application explicitly cited public health and safety as the basis for their decisions:

1. Councilmember Skorman: "I can't support this kind of a dense project right now in our WUI for health and safety reasons."
2. Councilmember Dave Donelson: "One of the criteria we must base our decisions on is that it is not detrimental to public health and safety [T]his isn't just another infill site . . . it's one with a real history . . . [a]nd the real history is we had a big fire here not long ago right next to it."
3. President Strand: "[O]ne of the criteria is health and safety. . . . I'm going to keep my foot on the pedal as best as I can to make sure that we keep our promises to our City to keep everybody safe."

Ms. Chalfin asked you, "This also plays into the development question, right? And you know, you've talked a lot about responsible growth and in terms of high density development, mixed use and so forth, there are a number of proposals in some of our most at-risk areas. And I'm wondering how you feel about developments on the west side, for instance, where it is some of the most at-risk areas."

You responded, "...Now let's talk about [24-24](#). Yeah, I'm an economic developer. I'm for growth that is responsible. I am for growth that is sustainable. I am for growth that is intelligent. I do want to see us tackle our affordable housing project. I do want to see development. I do want to see info, I do want to see density cuz that's how we solve those problems. **But in this issue, the residents have spoken**, they have voiced their concern that maybe the time is not now. Maybe we need to look at a different pocket of the city for that development. And so as mayor, that was one of those areas, the 24-24 project that I believe demands the mayor's attention, demands the mayor's visibility. The mayor needs to show up. And that's an opportunity where I will be leaning into."

Will you be fulfilling your campaign promise that you need to show up and protect the citizens who clearly heard this and voted for you thinking you would protect their public safety?

In addition to your campaign promise regarding development at this dangerous chokepoint, below is a concise list of reasons to stand-up and tell your planning department both the courts and the people have spoken:

1. City Council ruled on the 2424 Project (directly across the street from this proposed development) that any increase in density at the corner of 30th St. and GOG Rd would be detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. The City Council's decision was upheld by the District Court and the Court of Appeals. City officials took an oath of office to uphold the law. The rezone will not comply with 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B) of the rezone criteria. The city planner should not approve this project.
2. The Project has asserted that the rezone will comply with the Hillside Overlay standards. However, in fact, the Project does not comply with 10 of the Hillside Development Ordinances, nor does it comply with 20 of the Hillside Development Guidelines (HDG). The current average height of the buildings running along GOG Rd are 23 feet tall, this Project proposes 38-foot-tall buildings which do not fit in with the surrounding area. The HDG are to reduce height and density the closer the developments approach the hillside. The 38-foot-tall buildings will block the silhouette of the hillside from the public right-of-way on GOG Rd, which is a major violation of the HDG. The significant increase in density is also a major violation of the HDG. City Council rejected the 2424 Project for these reasons and it's decision was upheld by the District and Appellate Courts.

3. The Parkland Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) requires 5.5 acres of land for every 1,000 residents. The current Level of Service (LOS) for our Foothills area is 2.0 acres per 1,000 people which is the worst LOS in Colorado Springs for a mature area. The Project Statement indicates the residents in these 222 units will have easy access to the existing parks. The closest Neighborhood Park is the Mountain Shadows Park which is 1.9 miles away. The PLDO Criteria Manual indicates Neighborhood Parks are "walk-to" parks - "Every residence should have reasonable access to a Neighborhood Park". Most people will agree that 1.9 miles is not reasonable. The very poor PLDO LOS was a third reason that the City Council disapproved of the 2424 Project.

4. On 3/20/23, a Neighborhood meeting with the City's OEM and Police at the Fire Station #18 was held to discuss evacuation planning. The OEM/police disclosed that their method of traffic management for an evacuation is decided in a meeting where attendees provided their personal ideas. They do not use, nor are they authorized to use modeling tools, such as those used by FEMA which show where traffic chokepoints will occur and the optimal locations for contraflow. The 2012 Waldo Fire was the worst fire in Colorado's history – so bad that the President of the U.S. visited the Mountain Shadows Community, the heart of the fire which burned 347 homes to the ground, killed two people, damaged hundreds of other homes, evacuated over 32,000 people, and caused "a devastating blow to our collective sense of safety and security"

(RE: <https://www.cspm.org/cos-150-story/waldo-canyon-and-black-forest-fires/>). A photo from the Waldo fire was presented to City Council during the 2424 Project, taken from I-25 looking west over Woodmen Rd at the intersection of Corporate Dr. This was the merge point at the end of the contraflow. The photo shows 2 lanes of contraflow from the west along with 3 lanes of normal flow from the west. Traffic management had to alternate stopping the two outbound flows in order to merge the contraflow traffic back onto the normal eastbound lanes. According to evidence gathered by the Mountain Shadows Action Team from interviewing residents along Woodmen Rd, the alternate stopping of the traffic caused a 2.7 mile backup, to at least, the entrance of the Peregrine subdivision. Additionally, the neighbors said that the traffic was so bad that traffic from secondary roads could not enter onto Woodmen Rd. – these are known as chokepoints. When this information was conveyed to the OEM/Police during the Neighborhood meeting, the response was; "We know we could have done better". Without the proper modeling tools to help OEM/Police to scientifically identify chokepoints and contraflow locations, along with at least a 15% growth since the 2012 Waldo fire, evacuation conditions have been exacerbated making it even more detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience, or general welfare. Under 7.1.103.A (formerly, 7.5.603.B), this project does not meet the criteria to rezone. The city planner must stop this project.

The city planner's first and foremost responsibility is to uphold city code. As demonstrated in this document, there are an overwhelming number of violations that are justifiable in stopping the Arrowswest development. Will you be telling the city planner that they cannot approve this project because of the public threat to your constituents as you campaigned you would do?

Sincerely,
Leslie Jonas