

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Maureen Kirchdoerfer <releasemecreations@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 3, 2022 12:06 AM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: RE: No apartments at Otero and Old Ranch

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

I'd like to include light pollution into my argument as well. As a citizen I don't feel much power or hope that this message will be taken seriously because money is what drives most everything these days, but in an outside chance there is hope that this development will not go through I am sending this on. How amazing it would be to have a park with some trails there for everyone to enjoy instead of more traffic headaches and road expansions ruining the quiet we have up here. Please hear my plea!

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

----- Original message -----

From: Maureen Kirchdoerfer <releasemecreations@hotmail.com>
Date: 3/2/22 11:52 PM (GMT-07:00)
To: gabe.sevigny@coloradosprings.gov
Subject: No apartments at Otero and Old Ranch

I would like to go on record that as a member of the Creekside community just up the street I am entirely against this development. The traffic is one issue, filling in every last bit of land with a building and parking lots is another. I just moved here from a nightmare city that grew to a breaking point and they are still building because of the greed. Please do not build this development. You're ruining a city we moved to because we were escaping this sort of thing, we were under the assumption that more open space was revered in Colorado instead of turning it into a traffic nightmare concrete jungle.

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: amanda manship <shudda25@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 2, 2022 10:49 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Development Proposal comments - Old Ranch and Otero
Attachments: Screenshot_20220302-223331_Nextdoor.jpg

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

Mr Sevigny,

I'm writing in regards to the proposed multi-family development on Old Ranch Road near Otero (see attached for file numbers in question).

I am unable to open the link listed on the notice (I receive an invalid link error), so if there is information there that addresses my concerns, I would appreciate you sharing.

I'm very concerned at the idea of developing a multifamily community at this location for a couple reasons.

The first is traffic. Unless there are plans to widen Old Ranch Road BEFORE any construction begins, there will be huge traffic implications to the residents of the communities located east of this proposed development. Even so, I assume a light would be added at the intersection which would cause additional traffic backup given the close proximity with the light at the Old Ranch/Voyager intersection (which is already timed very poorly for drivers going south to Voyager).

Additionally, the schools in the area are already overpopulated with students and not enough faculty. My son was removed from his special needs program because they did not have enough staff to support his needs, and there were other more needing children. I can't imagine the additional burden on the schools if a multifamily building is added to this zoned area without additional schools being built (and teachers/staff hired) to support children that will inevitably live in this complex.

Amanda Manship
Resident of Bison Ridge at Kettle Creek

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Maureen Kirchdoerfer <releasemecreations@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 2, 2022 11:52 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: No apartments at Otero and Old Ranch

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

I would like to go on record that as a member of the Creekside community just up the street I am entirely against this development. The traffic is one issue, filling in every last bit of land with a building and parking lots is another. I just moved here from a nightmare city that grew to a breaking point and they are still building because of the greed. Please do not build this development. You're ruining a city we moved to because we were escaping this sort of thing, we were under the assumption that more open space was revered in Colorado instead of turning it into a traffic nightmare concrete jungle.

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Ann Kumm <akummco1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 8:58 AM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapels No. 1 and 2 Development Proposals

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

Dear Mr. Sevigny,

I have become aware of the development proposal for land parcels along Old Ranch Road.

My husband and I are taking this opportunity to express our displeasure with this plan.

We live in Pine Creek and have seen the ever-creeping development along Old Ranch Road and its confluence with Voyager Parkway and have felt the impact. From increased traffic along Old Ranch Road (with no appropriate shoulder), to increased traffic noise from heavy, noisy trucks, motorcycles and Black Forest residents racing through the area to get back to their homes it is all just too much!

There are four D20 schools that enter and empty their bus and parent traffic onto Old Ranch Road (Encompass Heights Elem., Pine Creek HS, Mountain View Elem. and Challenger MS) twice daily during the school year. While the stoplights at Chapel Hills Drive and Old Ranch Road have helped, the road is really inadequate in many ways. Pavement at the above intersection is horrible as well. And as mentioned before, there is no shoulder on the portion of Old Ranch west of Kettle Creek.

The incredible pace of development at the Voyager and Interquest area has greatly increased traffic there, to the point that there are often long lines of traffic trying to turn at the stoplight at Old Ranch and Voyager Parkway. And as an avid cyclist, I can't for the life of me understand why El Paso County and the City of Colorado Springs can't or won't consider setting aside safe shoulders/bike lanes AT A MINIMUM on already-wide roads like Voyager Parkway. We used to be able to ride safely on Voyager even though there is no such dedicated lane, but with the huge growth along there now that is no longer tenable. The same is now happening to Old Ranch Road. I just can't understand the need for putting more development into an area that is already seeing a huge influx of development until some basic infrastructure can be built.

COS likes to call itself "Olympic City" but it is developing at a pace that doesn't pay attention to its residents' wishes or desires. Developers are the winners at residents' expense. Entire neighborhoods are becoming islands without enough appropriate, safe outlets from a traffic standpoint. It feels like we are pitting residents against residents just to get to our destinations safely. In addition, crime and public safety are quickly deteriorating at the same time that the city is having a hard time retaining and hiring new police and fire employees. The city is just unable to keep up with the needs. On behalf of myself and my husband, as well as my neighbors in this area, I implore the City of Colorado Springs to slow down on the pace of development. Not only does it impact current residents, but we all know that the quality of construction and code/inspection enforcement has resulted in thousands of sub-par homes, apartments and multi-family units awaiting future residents. It is a lose-lose situation. Please listen to residents' concerns on this and other developments.

Respectfully,
Ann Kumm

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Michele Clapper <shellbug9@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 4:32 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapel Annexation and Development

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

I am a resident of the Springcrest subdivision located south of the Hope Chapel Annexation 1 and 2 development project. I often enter Old Ranch Road from Otero Avenue. The traffic impacts, certainly, are a concern of mine considering that this section of Old Ranch Road is basically a two-lane country road with little to no shoulder. Adding a multi-family development, as well as entering/exiting traffic from services at the church could be rather challenging for drivers wishing to enter/exit my neighborhood, and could potentially add quite a bit of traffic to Otero Ave., which is also a two-lane country road with very little to no shoulder.

Traffic, however, is not my only concern. The deceptive practice of developers purchasing residential property and then requesting annexation and rezoning for the purpose of their monetary gain is a real concern to me. The price of residential property is far less than commercial. If you are planning to operate a business, then you should be buying property zoned commercial with adequate utilities in place. There are zoning laws in place for a reason. A Master Plan was developed, with input from citizens, analyzing, identifying, and creating zoning regulations. If these constant re-zoning requests are being granted, ignoring the Master Plan, then perhaps a new Master Plan should be developed with citizens input. This practice of annexing and re-zoning, and allowing developers to decide how our community should be zoned must be stopped. Otherwise, why have a Master Plan at all? A church and a multi-family housing development are not commercial, but to the property owners surrounding this proposed new development, the zoning changes to allow a multi-family housing development are not fair. They own their properties expecting the zoning to remain as when they purchased it. Property owners, zoned R-2.5, adjacent to the deceptive purchase of the two residential lots further west and south of this property are now, thanks to City Council, living next to two properties annexed into the city with a zoning change to OC, operating a commercial business, and further developing the properties by building a 13,300 sf building. City council ignored countless requests by neighbors to halt this deceptive practice of purchasing residential properties, at residential prices, getting them annexed, and changing the zoning so that they can operate a business. In this case, they intend to construct a multi-family development, again requesting a re-zoning, using the property as it was not intended. Additionally, the property owners adjacent to the aforementioned properties, and the Hope Chapel/Multifamily Development, are unable to vote for City Council as their property is in El Paso county! There are two lots, zoned RR-5 and RR-2.5, to the north of this property, one to the west, and one to the south that, I'm sure, the greedy developers will go after next, claiming they are adjacent to property that has already been annexed into the city and been re-zoned. Where does it end?

While reviewing the initial application on the LDRS website, I noticed on page 5, under location, that the narrative *attempts* to explain how the project will meet the 1/6 contiguity requirement for annexation. Are they, a property owner, allowed to include a public road in this calculation? That part of Old Ranch Road is currently in the county, obviously, or it wouldn't need to be annexed. Is the county requesting this annexation? Further, is the property itself "just shy" of the 1/6 contiguous requirement, or, including Old Ranch Road and coming up with 14.4943 AC, are they still "just shy" of the requirement? They then propose to meet this requirement by annexing "concurrently in two phases". The first annexation is 4.6136 AC and is 20.62% contiguous. The second is 9.8807 AC and is 19.86% contiguous. How were these figures calculated? If it is necessary to annex the first phase in order to meet the second phase, how is this concurrent? What is the *initial* length of the contiguous city boundary that does not include Old Ranch Road? Do they then, use the first annexation that includes Old Ranch Road as city contiguous boundary? The narrative is very vague. I'm sure the developers somehow arrived at these figures, I just would like to know how, and if it is an allowable practice to do so. Is there a way to request a map and narrative showing how these figures were calculated? If 11.1073

AC or 14.4943 AC (whichever the case may be) cannot meet the 1/6 (16.666%) contiguous requirement, how does 4.6136 AC calculate to 20.62%?

Also, on page 6, the narrative states “industrial/office development lies to the north”. In fact, there are 2 additional RR-2.5, RR-5 lots to the north. This lot, developed as proposed, would be surrounded by RR-2.5 and RR-5 properties, with the exception of the subdivision to the east that is naturally buffered by Kettle Creek. The map that follows shows this, but again, the narrative does not match, implying that the area that the property is located in is a growing industrial/office development, when, in fact, it is not, it is residential.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to my concerns, and I hope to hear from you regarding my questions about this project.

Respectfully Submitted,
Donna M. Clapper

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: John Hotchkiss <johnhotchkiss36@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 5:54 AM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Re: Hope Chapel Annexations No. 1 & 2 - Comments

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

Gabe,

No problem at all. Here are the contents of my letter:

RE: Hope Chapel Annexations No. 1 & 2

Project File Numbers: CPC A 21-00154 / 21-00155, CPC ZC 22-00027, CPC CP 22-00028

Attn: Gabe Sevigny

Date: 03/07/2022

I am the neighbor located immediately southeast of this proposed project at 2210 Old Ranch Rd. I own 2290 Old Ranch Rd. When 2210 was initially purchased, I met one of the new owners and they indicated that Hope Chapel intended to build a new sanctuary and campus for their place of worship. I indicated that I would be more than happy to help in any way I could to facilitate their project as a neighbor.

However, this project proposal is far from just a new sanctuary.

By my count from the initial proposal, I am seeing 96 individual homes nestled in 24 buildings. Conversely, I see only one church building. It would seem that this project is a multifamily development project, with the remainder of land being used for a small church. This is not what was presented to me in our initial conversation whatsoever.

The Annexation portion of this project is understandable as the two properties to the west (church and recovery center) both were annexed in order to provide sufficient utilities, and these uses were permitted in current Zoning. I myself had queried the City about annexation

for a project we had proposed for our own land, but were denied due to “change of use” reasons. As this project is primarily a change of use to Multifamily, I am expecting the City to be consistent and also deny annexation due to “change of use”. That, or revisit our request to allow us either a Waiver to Annex or a full Annexation into the City.

In a portion of this proposal, it appears that the street directly in front of my property would also be annexed into the City street system, thereby requiring City land development codes to dictate curb and gutter, lighting, fire, bridge, and street maintenance requirements. I am concerned that if these elements are not covered during this development, we would be required to cover those costs if we develop our own property in the future. I would like this issue discussed/explained if possible.

In regards to the project plan, I do not see a subdivision request. In order to achieve the two-step annexation city boundary requirements (1/6 min.), it looks like the property is being divided in order to accomplish this. Will there be a formal subdivision made?

We have a water well that is active and permitted. We also have available to us CSU water for residential use only. Depending on the use of our property, the water well may be used for potable drinking water. Given the large, proposed development, I imagine our well water will be affected by 96 homes and a church – even with mitigation efforts of the drainage ponds. I would hope CSU would grant us dual use (commercial or residential) of their water service if this project is approved. Otherwise, we could lose potable water to our property for some uses.

An annexation of this property into the City limits in order build a place of worship is more than welcome. Building a place of worship here is more than welcome. Using a church build to disguise a large multifamily development is both misleading and not welcome. I believe concessions could be made to mitigate impact on this community, and I would imagine Hope Chapel would strive to do so.

John P. Hotchkiss

719-339-9937

From: Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov>

Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 2:56 PM

To: John Hotchkiss <johnhotchkiss36@msn.com>

Subject: RE: Hope Chapel Annexations No. 1 & 2 - Comments

Hello,

I am not able to open attachments from sources outside the City that are not trusted. You can either copy and paste to the body of the email, or you can mail or drop off at 30 S Nevada ave, Suite 701, Attn: Gabe Sevigny, Colorado Springs, CO 80903. Let me know if you have additional questions.

Gabe Sevigny

719-385-5088

Planning Supervisor | South Team

Gabe.Sevigny@ColoradoSprings.gov

Office Hours: Monday through Friday 8:00 am – 5:00 pm

From: John Hotchkiss <johnhotchkiss36@msn.com>

Sent: Monday, March 7, 2022 1:35 PM

To: Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov>

Subject: Hope Chapel Annexations No. 1 & 2 - Comments

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

RE: Hope Chapel Annexations No. 1 & 2

Project File Numbers: **CPC A 21-00154 / 21-00155, CPC ZC 22-00027, CPC CP 22-00028**

Attn: **Gabe Sevigny**

Project comments attached.

John Hotchkiss

719-339-9937

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Laurie Dick <ladidah@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 10:02 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapel Annexations No 1 and 2

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

Dear Mr Sevigny,

I would like to voice my concerns about the Hope Chapel Annexations No 1&2.

In my opinion this plan to rezone a country residential property to a multi-family development plus commercial space (church) is not a good idea and would destroy the character of my neighborhood and adjacent neighborhoods.

Creekside Estates is a neighborhood consisting of 216 single family homes straddling Old Ranch Road. We are a neighborhood that is divided by a road that is becoming more like a freeway. The traffic is constant and it is fast. The hill creates a huge temptation for drivers to speed up and down the road — in the middle of our neighborhood. The addition of those 120 apartments, plus the traffic to and from the church will increase the traffic, speed, and noise on Old Ranch road to levels that are unbearable to those of us whose homes back up to that road. The traffic study that has been completed has a lot of numbers and calculations, but it can not possibly quantify actual impact that this increased traffic will have on our quality of life. There is no way for this study to gauge the noise caused by the racing traffic, the jake brakes from the trucks or the revving engines preparing to climb the hill.

These plans are referred to as “bridging the gap” between the surrounding residential development to the east and south and the commercial and industrial development to the west and south. But it does not appear to me to be a very graceful way to “bridge the gap”. Bridging the gap in my mind looks more like a group of townhomes on that 8 acres rather than a huge apartment complex that is more that 50% the size of our entire neighborhood.

The traffic from the church is going to be heaviest on Sunday morning according to the traffic study, and that makes sense, but as we all know, it will not be limited to Sundays as churches have activities going on each and every day of the week. And, unfortunately for us, Sunday is the only morning that we currently have a little bit of a break from the traffic.

I feel like a residential area on a much smaller scale might be a more appropriate use for that space so close to Creekside Estates and to the little ranchettes on the south side of Old Ranch Road.

Thank you for letting me voice my concerns.

Sincerely,
Laurie Dick
2450 Lumberjack Dr, 80920
719-338-4327
ladidah@gmail.com

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Ronald Dick <ronmobydick@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 10:36 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapel Annexations No. 1 & 2

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

Dear Planning and Community Development,

Colorado Springs and El Paso County have been growing faster than anyone would think possible! The north part of Colorado Springs is exploding with new commercial and residential construction. Interquest to Northgate on Voyager, and the new subdivisions around Pine Creek High School are examples of this growth. As a result, the traffic on Old Ranch Road has become very fast and very noisy. The increased volume of traffic has even made a stop light at Chapel Hills Road necessary. I had hoped that the stoplight would slow traffic down a bit, but it only seems to have encouraged drivers to race west down Old Ranch Road even faster. This occurs at all hours of the day and night!

Traffic and noise have been the biggest impact for us so far, but now the growth has literally come to my backyard.

If these plans for the church and the 120 unit apartment complex are approved, it is inevitable, at least in my opinion, that Old Ranch Road, east and west of Kettle Creek will have to be widened to 4 lanes. Even with Old Ranch as a two lane road we have vehicles frequently racing and trying to pass each other. I can't imagine this road as a 4 lane road with merging lanes.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to voice my concerns. While you are considering this Annexation/Development, please keep in mind the effect that this huge increase in residential units will have on the traffic in my backyard. I see that a traffic signal is planned for Old Ranch Road and Hope Chapel intersection. Any additional form of traffic control or method of slowing the traffic would be highly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ronald Dick
2450 Lumberjack Drive 80920
Cell Phone 720-883-6629

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Jeff Brokaw <jefftb39@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 8, 2022 11:01 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: 2210 Old Ranch Rd.

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

I am writing about the property on 2210 Old Ranch RD. The property is visible from our home and several neighbors as well. The house cannot be seen, even from the street, as it is tucked behind the trees.

Hundreds if not thousands of homes have been added to this area lately with Kelowna View, Chapel Ridge, Cordera, north of Pine Creek HS, Etc. They all need Old Ranch. You will feel the bottleneck if you go by PCHS on a school day morning. The middle and elementary schools also draw a crowd.

The church at 1635 Old Ranch recently bought a house on Montezuma Rd only to knock down that house and the trees to build a parking lot. That same church is expanding now which further cuts down on the parking.

Two beautiful homes at 1785 and 1865 Old Ranch still exist but are no longer family homes. They are now a rehab facility that draws dozens of vehicles daily for the staff, clients and vendors.

I am concerned that another church and multi-family residential neighborhood could result in at least two lanes to get in and out which would be much larger than the current driveway. I am concerned that all the trees will be removed and the land will be flattened to add the buildings which I hope are not tall. I am concerned this would add a lot of traffic to the already stressed Old Ranch Rd. My greatest fear is Old Ranch gets widened or extended to I25. Either of those would be devastating to the neighborhood.

I understand the property owner gets to decide but do we as property owners, citizens, city planners have an obligation to maintain fresh air and green open spaces?

Is there a way to do this without modifying the road and removing the beautiful trees all over this lot?

Thank you,
Jeff Brokaw

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Diana De Haven <djdehaven@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 7:41 AM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapel Nos.1 & 2 development proposal

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

These comments come from both myself, Diana J. De Haven, and my husband, Robert L. Lang as property owners at 2420 Lumberjack Drive, Colorado Springs.

The most pressing concerns we see are traffic safety at the development entrance/exit, apartment noise, and increased traffic volume on Old Ranch Road as it passes through Creekside Estates.

Consider putting the entrance/exit either on Kettle Creek Road or nearby that road instead of competing with traffic at the intersection of Otero. The roadway is straight and level in the Kettle Creek Road area as opposed to traffic coming uphill on Old Ranch Road and suddenly meeting more congestion with additional turning vehicles.

Adding multi-family units to the area increases noise in a previously quiet setting. While trash collection stations are necessary, could they be located on the west end of the apartments? A dog run would be useful but couldn't it also be located at the west end of the development where the noise is directed away from homes in Creekside? Although the sketch is difficult to read, it looks like an amphitheater is planned or proposed. If so, I/we adamantly object. No matter how infrequently it might be used, such an amenity is unnecessary and a huge imposition on the neighborhood of Creekside. In addition, and out of respect for the nearby homeowners, please have the developer include a solid wall as a general noise barrier along the eastern property line and located above the trees/downhill slope. Apartment dwellers should appreciate a sound abatement wall to absorb traffic road noise as well.

The speed limit on Old Ranch Road used to be 35 mph, and to the surprise of residents, it was increased to 40 mph several years ago. Drivers typically speed through going ten or fifteen miles over the limit. It should be understood that we do not want more traffic adding to the noise and safety issue at Creekside.

Thank you for considering our thoughts on the proposed annexation and development.

Diana De Haven

Robert Lang

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Debbie Head <debbielhead@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 9:50 AM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapel Annexations

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

Good morning,

I am emailing to let you know my thoughts on the development on Old Ranch Road. We bought our property 5 years ago. The most desirable part was that we border Kettle Creek and have quite a bit of open space. This development will take away from that. There is quite a bit of wildlife in that area that will be displaced. With all the development on the east side of Powers that is channeling down Old Ranch Road this would only add to that dramatically and we are all very worried about the traffic. With all the development going on all over the city it would be nice to be able to retain some open green space.

Has there been any thoughts to how this would affect the creek, wildlife, traffic and the neighbors who live very close to this area? And no one ever mentions the water? Where are we getting all the water to support all the building. Doesn't appear there is enough thought going into infrastructure as well as the lack of water for all the building going on. I think we will dearly pay the consequences at some point.

Thank you,
Debbie Head

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Mike Head <mikewhead@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 10:38 AM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapel Annex

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

Greetings Mr. Sevigny, I'm writing to share my concerns about the proposed annexation of 14.49 acres at 2210 Old Ranch Road to be developed as a Church and Multi family project. I live on Stone Creek and back up to Old Ranch Road. I'd like to know how the City intends to mitigate traffic on Old Ranch Road for this proposed development given the 1000's of homes being built to the east. Traffic on Old Ranch Road has become constant and is only getting worse. Cars regularly speed by exceeding the speed limit and frequently pass cars on the shoulder creating a very dangerous situation when trying to enter traffic. It's amazing that no one has been killed or injured (yet).

Also, where does the City intend to obtain water for all this development? Is an environmental impact study being done on how this development will impact Kettle Creek which is adjacent to this property? What happens to all the wild life that lives along the creek? Seems the City is so consumed with development that any thought to long term consequences of all this unchecked growth have been ignored. I'd appreciate answers to these questions before a decision has been made to allow this development to proceed.

Thanks, Mike Head
2515 Stone Creek Road
720.465.0120

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: clair doughty <clairdoughty984@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 2:24 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapel Annexations No. 1 & 2

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

Dear Council of Planning and Community Development,

We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed rezoning on Old Ranch Road. While the local community may be unable to prevent development that in itself will be detrimental to the area, many residents in the Creekside neighborhood are opposed to the addition of multi-family housing that will cause traffic and safety problems, destroy local wildlife habitat, and potentially lower the property values of the existing community.

While traffic may be lighter on average, the local neighborhood traffic will disproportionately surge during morning and evening rush hours, causing traffic issues during critical times for the existing neighborhood. In general, the area traffic is continuing to increase, and heavy traffic is already common at times.

Wildlife has been observed in the area, and any development will destroy their habitat.

Property values are likely to go down in the area where multi-family apartments or condominiums are built. Multi-family dwellings are inconsistent with the neighborhood developed in the area.

I urge you to disapprove the proposed rezoning, and from recent discussions with my neighbors, I know my opinions are shared by many.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,

Clair and Wendy Doughty

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Maureen Kirchdoerfer <ReleaseMeCreations@hotmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 6:39 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: No development Otero and Old Ranch

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

Would like to add the destruction of a green space, animal habitat when it is unnecessary to do so as there are plenty of available construction sites that are in places that are not existing green space as this one. There are plenty of sites along 25, or even in active zones right up in Interquest up the street. This is a quiet area. This is completely unnecessary and should not proceed forward. Leave the peace and quiet alone!

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Tony Vincent <tvince1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, March 9, 2022 8:14 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapel Annexation

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

Good evening,

My name is Robert Vincent and I am a homeowner living in 10520 Marble Creek Circle, COS 80908. I am writing in regards to the notice I receive about the proposed Hope Chapel Annexation across Kettle Creek from my home. I am concerned about this proposed project for several reasons:

- 1) The environment around Kettle Creek to include watershed pathways, bushes, and trees must be maintained. This creek catches water runoff from heavy snow and rains and also acts as a wildlife corridor. Any development on this property must not be allowed too close to the creek area.
- 2) The height of the proposed church must not obstruct residential views of the mountain line. This will negatively affect our home values and result in legal action from our HOA. Furthermore, if the church is visible to homeowners, it should be designed in an architectural way that matches the scenery.
- 3) Old Range Road at this location is poorly maintained and quite narrow. This section of road is maintained by the county, not the city, and is a choke point for accidents. I am concerned that Sunday services will clog Old Ranch road for many hours of the day and limit access to our housing inlets.

These are basic concerns and should be addressed. If overlooked, then I will proceed with an official appeal.

Files numbers:

CPC A 21-00154
CPC A 21-00155
CPC ZC 22-00027
CPC CP 22-00028

Thank you and have a good week.

Robert Vincent
10520 Marble Creek Circle
Colorado Springs, CO 80908
Cell: (202) 660-3810

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Diana De Haven <djdehaven@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, March 11, 2022 11:24 AM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapel Annexation 1 & 2, Zone Change, and Concept Plan:

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

Thank you for returning my call. The question I had can wait till later in the process.

Most importantly I will appreciate our names being included in all future mailings for notification on the status of potential annexation/rezoning.

Diana J. De Haven and Robert L. Lang
2420 Lumberjack Dr, Colorado Springs, CO 80920

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Steve Luna <stevluna@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 2, 2022 6:28 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: 2210 Old Ranch Rd

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

Hi,

I recently became aware of the proposed Hope Chapel project at 2210 Old Ranch Rd. I am opposed to this project for many of the reasons that my neighbors have already stated. Could you please let me know the schedule for providing comments and what meetings are currently planned? Could you also put me on the email list for this project so that I receive updates of new meetings related to this project?

I live at 1975 Alamosa Dr.

Thank you,
Steve

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: amanda manship <shudda25@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 23, 2022 4:46 AM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Re: Hope Chapel Additions 1 & 2 - Annexations, Zone Change, Concept Plan

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

Mr Sevigny,

Thank you for letting myself and others who contacted you previously about this proposed development on Old Ranch Road know about the second submittal.

Given I've seen no additional information about plans to address comments received, my concerns about adding a multi-family complex in the zoned area are still valid and worry me.

Unless there are plans to widen Old Ranch Road BEFORE any construction begins, there will be huge traffic implications to the residents of the communities located east of this proposed development. Even so, I assume a light would be added at the intersection which would cause additional traffic backup given the close proximity with the light at the Old Ranch/Voyager intersection (which is already timed very poorly for drivers going south to Voyager).

Most importantly, the schools in the area are already overpopulated with students and not enough faculty. My son was removed from his special needs program because they did not have enough staff to support his needs, as there were other children who were determined to be more "needing" by the school. We have had several meetings with the school since I last emailed you and have been told the district despite putting out vacancies is unable to find qualified applicants to fill the shortage of faculty needed to take care of the current student population (not to mention the school is not big enough to house anymore students). I can't imagine the additional burden on the schools if a multifamily building is added to this zoned area without additional schools being built (and teachers/staff hired/available) to support children that will inevitably live in this complex.

Amanda Manship
Resident of Bison Ridge at Kettle Creek

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, June 22, 2022 12:54:53 PM
Subject: Hope Chapel Additions 1 & 2 - Annexations, Zone Change, Concept Plan

Hello,

As members of the public that have previously emailed me, this is to inform you that a 2nd submittal has been made. You can use the following application numbers, CPC A 21-00154, CPC A 21-00155, CPC ZC 22-00027, and CPC CP 22-00028 in the link below to review the comment letter and recent submittal. This review cycle is due July 5, 2022, if you could please provide any additional comments prior to that date and they would be included in the next review letter. Please let me know if you have any other questions.



Gabe Sevigny
Planning Supervisor
Land Use Review Division
City of Colorado Springs
Office: (719) 385-5088
Email: Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov

Links:

[Planning & Community Development Home](#)

[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#)

[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)

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

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Naomi Niess <nrniess@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 26, 2022 12:55 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Hope Chapel development

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

Gabe, we are homeowners in the Springcrest subdivision. We use Old Ranch Rd and Otero to exit our neighborhood. It will cause much congestion to add a multifamily neighborhood at the location planned at Otero and Old Ranch Rd. It will also destroy all the beautiful wildlife habitat that is currently enjoyed there ... and that is part of the reason we live where we live! We love the quiet neighborhood, peaceful setting, and wildlife. A 13,000 ft rehab facility is already approved to be built...and construction as started.... on Old Ranch Rd close to Voyager, so traffic has already become heavier.

Please, we are already seeing hundreds of apartment units being built all over the city....and do we really need all this growth given the water situation we are facing? How do the developers get approval for the water? We sold off a 2 1/2 acre land for one house, and it took us 5 yrs to get approval for a well!...and had to prove 300 yrs of water to that well from an attorney located in AZ!! So how are the developers justifying their 300 years of water to all these properties?

And where can I read about the description of how many units will be built, and is there really a church/chapel being built, too, or is Hope Chapel the name of the neighborhood? We know government is government, but the citizens of this city...and this area....should have rights, also, as that's all I hear about anymore are about 'rights'.....but it really doesn't seem to matter what we feel, express, or write anymore.....so where are the rights.

Interesting that your email out to all of us had at the bottom of it, "please consider the environment before writing this email." What an oxymoron given what we are doing to our beautiful Colorado Springs environment by destroying more open green spaces, taking out trees, and limiting natural wildlife.

Naomi & Oliver Niess
10055 Kit Carson Ln

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Brian Fasterling <waskulywabut@q.com>
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 2:00 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Cc: allCouncil@springsgov.com; R Marshall
Subject: Yet More City Corruption

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

Mr. Sevigny:

You will not find this e-mail full of deferential pleasantries because your office is yet again ignoring the critical input of affected residents in favor of yet another crooked developer bribing city officials and/or engaging in quid pro quo tactics.

I'm referring to the Hope Chapel debacle that is being rammed down the throats of area residents who have far more capacity to see the long-term disastrous effects of this project than your office is willing to admit. These people live there and are therefore unquestionably the most adept at judging the impact on their community. Conversely, your office has historically and repeatedly demonstrated an outright disdain for the communities in which unscrupulous developers impose destructive and vehemently unwanted projects.

This project stinks of corruption by the same developer (NES) who has shown nothing but dismissive hostility to the local communities they invade. In 2020, our neighborhood PROVED to the City Council that NES and their client lied, on the record, about a project they slided through the approval process. We also PROVED that the city attorney threatened the planning commission into voting for the project. What did your office and the City Council do about it? Reward NES with everything they asked for, and then some. Open records requests PROVED Jill Gaebler was out to punish our neighborhood for daring to fight back against a corrupt developer. Your office and the City Council turned a blind eye at every corner. We PROVED multiple city codes were being violated by NES's development plan. No problemo, per your office and the City Council. We PROVED the city code specifically recommends our neighborhood NOT be annexed into the city. No problemo again. We PROVED NES lied yet again about their future development plans. No problemo once more. The developer admitted in a City Council meeting they should have done better research on their proposed plans (and at the same time never denied the lies they told) and should have looked elsewhere for their invasive project. The city's response? Essentially it was, "Oh, that's OK. We all make mistakes. Besides, you've already spent a lot of money on this. The local community will have to pay for your negligence". And Wayne Williams' assessment? Despite what everyone in our neighborhood feels, it has no historical or intrinsic value because at some point it was all ranch land. By that insulting, infantile and disdainful logic, none of Colorado is of any historical or intrinsic value because at some point it was all under water. That's the sort of appalling and reprehensible behavior we have all seen throughout city offices when communities who are tired of being bullied by developers come forward and voice their concerns. Why would the situation with this project be any different? The precedent established heretofore is incontrovertible.

Your office and the City Council has routinely capitulated to developers flashing money before your eyes, all the while summarily dismissing the communities those developers are steamrolling. We all know the only reason you solicit public input is because you are required to by law and it's too difficult to sidestep that process without getting caught and suffering severe consequences as a result. If you had your way you'd eliminate all public input and just do whatever you want, which is essentially what you do now by just ignoring us. Your office made it abundantly clear they were nothing but irritated with our input when 97% of our entire community vehemently objected to a plan NES forced on us against our will. I have every confidence citizen input will yet again be ignored for this project. "Community involvement" is irrefutably an absolute farce.

The stench of corruption perennially lingers in your and the City Council's offices. You let obviously commercial developers buy residential property, then get it rezoned to commercial status. This has happened time and time again, saving those precious developers millions by not having to pay commercial real estate prices. This Hope Chapel project is another perfect example. It's a commercial operation (multi-family housing) masquerading as a church. The developer bribed the city by "donating" a church in exchange for project approval of a commercial endeavor on residential land. If that's not quid pro quo I don't know what is. It's so shady it deserves federal investigation.

That ridiculously ill-conceived project will absolutely snarl traffic in the immediate area, but no one in your office cares. Just add some turning lanes and a new traffic light. Problem solved. Real world result? The people who because of heavy and speeding Old Ranch traffic already can't get out of the Springcrest subdivision to turn west on Old Ranch will have to wait even longer now, especially when school is in session for 8 months out of the year and cars are backed up 10 deep on Otero. Clearly, no one in your office has spent any time at that intersection watching the traffic build up on Otero at school and morning commute times, or watching people screaming down Old Ranch past that intersection, or watching how suddenly and unexpectedly eastbound speeding cars crest the blind hill just west of that intersection, or watching impatient road-raging morons try to pass other cars on the narrow 2-lane bridge over Kettle Creek.

We already have a problem with parents careening through the Springcrest neighborhood on Otero at 10-15 mph above the posted speed limit. Now you want to put a traffic light at Old Ranch and Otero so those same westbound idiots wanting to turn south on Otero are forced to wait to do so, which just pisses them off even more, so they drive that much faster through our neighborhood (which has no sidewalks) to drop their kids off at the elementary school. Now they're 2 minutes later to work because they're too damn lazy to plan accordingly, so they haul ass back down Otero to Old Ranch. WE LIVE HERE. We see it EVERY DAY. Your office is pitifully incapable of managing the road-raging results of your incompetent and/or dismissive planning. We've already had one neighbor hit by a speeding and inattentive carpool Mom who was just "too rushed" one afternoon to pay attention to the community she speeds through every day. Approval of this sham of a project will only make it worse, and anyone that gets run over by one of these reckless drivers will be on your hands because you were repeatedly warned of the consequences of poor judgement, yet chose to worship developer money over public input and public safety.

To make matters worse, every idea we come up with to try and mitigate the disastrous results of your office's poor planning (i.e., more reckless traffic being funneled into our peaceful, rural residential community) gets denied by one official or another. "We're gonna f' up your neighborhood and there's nothing you can do about it."

We've seen the pattern all too frequently. The developer spends lots of money to come up with an invasive, unscrupulous and hair-brained plan and the City obsequiously acquiesces because "it wouldn't be fair" to deny the plan after they invested so much, no matter how disastrous the project's impact on a community. No one thinks those developers would even go that far unless the City already told them, long before any public input was begrudgingly solicited, they would get the green light to start drafting up plans.

The real insult is how much emphasis the "review" process then puts on ridiculously trivial things like a missing comma, or un-capitalized headings, or other totally BS "requirements", yet incredibly valid and insightful public input is summarily ignored and relegated to an appendix of required content. The malfeasance of public officials and obscene deference to money-waving developers is blatantly transparent to all of us, and the consistent reply we get is patronizing dismissals of our concerns. "Your input is considered along with the developer's". That's clearly BS. "You can vote or get involved in the process." No, we can't, because we live in the county and the city keeps stealing our land and annexing it so their precious developers can have it at residential rates. "You can make your voice heard at public input meetings." We've done that and were summarily treated like pests. Furthermore, we sometimes find out about a "public" meeting after it already happened. How sleazy is that? Did someone "accidentally" forget to send out the required notices? Did more bribes or "donations" get paid to keep the meeting secret so only the developer had the ear of decision-makers?

I've read all the other comments attached to this proposed project and they're all full of platitudes like "please" and "if you'd be so kind" and "with all due respect". Your office and the City Council deserve *no respect whatsoever* because of

how citizen input is habitually ignored in favor of developers like NES. Anyone voting in favor of yet another corrupt, atrocious debacle like this has no conscience. They are a sellout to money at the expense of families who have to live with the consequences. We are thoroughly ashamed of you and your pandering to influencers. You claim to know what's best for the community, but we are the community and we know what's in our best interest. Approving this project just cements the city's legacy of being owned by developers. The people who make up Colorado Springs are thus nuisances who get in the way of those in power who have no conscience. Except for having met my wife here, I now fully regret having moved to Colorado Springs in 1997. I feel sorry for the lifetime residents who have watched a once beautiful and peaceful city let its public officials get so willingly hypnotized and overrun by shallow developer money. It's an absolute disgrace, with no end in sight.

Your dishonor will live on forever.

Most Disrespectfully,

Brian FASTERLING

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: (null) (null) <tvince1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 9:56 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Re: Hope Chapel Additions 1 & 2 - Annexations, Zone Change, Concept Plan

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

Hello Gabe,

After looking over the proposal to annex the area into the city, I do not support the application and would like to petition against it. This area cannot support low-cost multifamily units in addition to heavy church traffic on a small two-lane road at this section of Old Ranch. How do I submit a protest against this proposal? Thank you.

Robert Vincent

On Jun 22, 2022, at 12:54 PM, Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

As members of the public that have previously emailed me, this is to inform you that a 2nd submittal has been made. You can use the following application numbers, CPC A 21-00154, CPC A 21-00155, CPC ZC 22-00027, and CPC CP 22-00028 in the link below to review the comment letter and recent submittal. This review cycle is due July 5, 2022, if you could please provide any additional comments prior to that date and they would be included in the next review letter. Please let me know if you have any other questions.

<image001.png>

Gabe Sevigny

Planning Supervisor

Land Use Review Division

City of Colorado Springs

Office: (719) 385-5088

Email: Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov

Links:

[Planning & Community Development Home](#)

[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#)

[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)

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

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Steve Luna <stevluna@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2022 5:37 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: Re: Hope Chapel Additions 1 & 2 - Annexations, Zone Change, Concept Plan

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

Dear Mr. Sevigny,

I am opposed to the Hope Chapel annexation, zone change, and concept plan for several reasons.

The development will worsen traffic on Old Ranch Rd. Although the traffic study states that the development will not make traffic worse than background traffic, the study does not consider the impact of other developments along Old Ranch. If this application is approved, it will set a precedent for other properties along that section of Old Ranch, between Voyager and Kettle Creek, that want to do the same. The traffic study did not consider the impact of all of those properties. Considered individually, any one property may not be significant enough to warrant an expansion of Old Ranch, but considered together, they would be. The city should commission a study, or require the developer to commission one, if their plan is to allow increasing density all along that section of Old Ranch. Such a study would find that the city should start collecting fees from developers rezoning properties on Old Ranch so that it can be expanded to four lanes later.

Also, the city should include a light at the corner of Old Ranch and Otero, and this development is a perfect opportunity to make the developer pay for it. Once the city rezones the property, it will be instantly worth more. In exchange, the developer should pay to upgrade the services. The intersection of Old Ranch and Otero is already dangerous because traffic travels uphill on Old Ranch from Kettle Creek to Otero, and at Otero there is a bend in the hill that creates a blind spot to oncoming traffic. This blind spot makes turning left from Old Ranch onto Otero extremely dangerous. A lot of traffic turns left from Old Ranch onto Otero during TCA Central Elementary drop off and pick up times.

Page 17 of the 6/21/22 correspondence for CPC A 21-00155 states:

“Based on the updated traffic report provided by SM Rocha with this resubmittal a left turn lane is no longer required. The maximum number of dwelling units has been reduced to reflect an accurate unit count for development. This reduction of units removes the need for the turn lane. Revised traffic report has been added to the dropbox.”

Why is a left turn lane no longer required, and how has the maximum number of dwelling units changed?

In addition to traffic concerns, I have concerns about the long term plans for Old Ranch. Why is this section of Old Ranch being considered for multi-family development? The properties to the north of this property are RR2.5, and most of the other properties along Old Ranch are RR2.5. It seems leaving the property as RR2.5 would be the most appropriate, or if they are going to be annexed, zoning them as single family homes would be the most appropriate.

The property is not a good candidate for annexation because it does not provide a gradual transition between the multi-family development and the single family developments to the south and east. Also, the proposed development will overburden local schools. Schools are already overcrowded, and adding a multifamily development will make it worse. The developer should be made to contribute fees for new schools in exchange for receiving a rezoning.

Also, Kettle Creek is an important watershed. Doesn't the property owner need to do an environmental impact report to

show that damage to the creek and its wildlife will not occur?

Also, is the owner's property a Prebles Meadow Jumping Mouse habitat? If so, what limits would that place on the property?

Sincerely,
Steve Luna

On Wed, Jun 22, 2022 at 8:54 PM Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

As members of the public that have previously emailed me, this is to inform you that a 2nd submittal has been made. You can use the following application numbers, CPC A 21-00154, CPC A 21-00155, CPC ZC 22-00027, and CPC CP 22-00028 in the link below to review the comment letter and recent submittal. This review cycle is due July 5, 2022, if you could please provide any additional comments prior to that date and they would be included in the next review letter. Please let me know if you have any other questions.



Gabe Sevigny

Planning Supervisor

Land Use Review Division

City of Colorado Springs

Office: (719) 385-5088

Email: Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov

Links:

[Planning & Community Development Home](#)

[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#)

[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)

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

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Brian FASTERLING <waskulywabut@q.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2022 10:37 AM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Cc: AllCouncil@springsgov.com; R Marshall; Friedman, Samuel; Hester, Morgan; All Council - DL
Subject: Re: Yet More City Corruption

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

Your reply is **exactly** what your office and the City Council has irrevocably proven we all know is useless...community input. City officials adore NES and give them whatever they want.

You say NES must obey city codes. That's utter BS. We showed how multiple city codes were clearly being violated by a different NES project, but when they feigned ignorance and said they didn't think so your office and the City Council shamelessly capitulated.

When NES ridiculously asserted a creek bisecting our **residential** community was a "natural" border between commercial and residential development, even though any 3rd grader could look at that and say Old Ranch Rd. was clearly the "natural" border, your office and the City Council again shamelessly capitulated without even looking at the area.

What NES wants, NES gets, as in their "independently" sourced traffic study for this project that miraculously states there will be zero traffic impact from this Hope Chapel (a.k.a. commercial multi-family housing) disaster. Will the City have the balls to insist on their own traffic analysis and required infrastructure improvements therefrom, or will they shamelessly capitulate yet again and make the taxpayers bear the cost of what NES is responsible for? We all know the answer.

NES will continue to flaunt code, redefine neighborhoods to their liking in violation of master plans, purchase bogus reports that tell them what they want to hear, gobble up residential well water for commercial purposes, buy residential property and then get it rezoned/annexed as they see fit, tell concerned communities to "shove it if you don't like it", lie to indifferent public offices, stick residents with the bill for things NES callously imposed on them and all other manner of immoral and/or illegal atrocities, but all of that is eagerly overlooked by your office and the City Council. Money talks and integrity walks.

So "with all due respect", "if you'd be so kind", "pretty please" quit blowing smoke up our skirts, because we all know where this is going to land. Quit asking for input no one in city government respects or even wants to hear. You're wasting our time with your faux due process and only making yourselves look that much more foolish in the end.

Brian FASTERLING

Tees, Mugs, Novelties & More!
GiggleBytes.redbubble.com

Sent from my iPad.

On Jun 27, 2022, at 3:52 PM, Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

Your comments have been received and are part of the public record. Thank you for participating in the process.

This item is still under review and as with all development requests is subject to City Code requirements that must be satisfied prior to presenting to the final decision-making body. In this case, the item has not yet been scheduled for public hearing. As a neighbor that has emailed, I will notify you of any resubmittals and/or dates of public hearings. As these meetings will be public hearings, you are able to voice your concerns to the appointed and elected officials for their consideration prior to a recommendation and final decision. Also please note, any decision made can be appealed, and those appeal instructions will be emailed as well. In addition, as your comments are part of the public record, they will be included in the meeting agenda for the Planning Commission and City Council's reference.

If you have further questions specific to this development request, you may contact me at 719-385-5088 or we can schedule a remote meeting using Microsoft Teams, or an in person meeting at your request.

Respectfully,



Gabe Sevigny
Planning Supervisor
Land Use Review Division
City of Colorado Springs
Office: (719) 385-5088
Email: Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov

Links:

[Planning & Community Development Home](#)

[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#)

[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)

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

From: Brian Fasterling <waskulywabut@q.com>
Sent: Monday, June 27, 2022 2:00 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov>
Cc: allCouncil@springsgov.com; R Marshall <sensibleconsultingllc@gmail.com>
Subject: Yet More City Corruption

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

Mr. Sevigny:

You will not find this e-mail full of deferential pleasantries because your office is yet again ignoring the critical input of affected residents in favor of yet another crooked developer bribing city officials and/or engaging in quid pro quo tactics.

I'm referring to the Hope Chapel debacle that is being rammed down the throats of area residents who have far more capacity to see the long-term disastrous effects of this project than your office is willing to admit. These people live there and are therefore unquestionably the most adept at judging the impact on their community. Conversely, your office has historically and repeatedly demonstrated an outright disdain for the communities in which unscrupulous developers impose destructive and vehemently unwanted projects.

This project stinks of corruption by the same developer (NES) who has shown nothing but dismissive hostility to the local communities they invade. In 2020, our neighborhood PROVED to the City Council that NES and their client lied, on the record, about a project they slided through the approval process. We also PROVED that the city attorney threatened the planning commission into voting for the project. What did your office and the City Council do about it? Reward NES with everything they asked for, and then some. Open records requests PROVED Jill Gaebler was out to punish our neighborhood for daring to fight back against a corrupt developer. Your office and the City Council turned a blind eye at every corner. We PROVED multiple city codes were being violated by NES's development plan. No problemo, per your office and the City Council. We PROVED the city code specifically recommends our neighborhood NOT be annexed into the city. No problemo again. We PROVED NES lied yet again about their future development plans. No problemo once more. The developer admitted in a City Council meeting they should have done better research on their proposed plans (and at the same time never denied the lies they told) and should have looked elsewhere for their invasive project. The city's response? Essentially it was, "Oh, that's OK. We all make mistakes. Besides, you've already spent a lot of money on this. The local community will have to pay for your negligence". And Wayne Williams' assessment? Despite what everyone in our neighborhood feels, it has no historical or intrinsic value because at some point it was all ranch land. By that insulting, infantile and disdainful logic, *none* of Colorado is of any historical or intrinsic value because at some point it was all under water. That's the sort of appalling and reprehensible behavior we have all seen throughout city offices when communities who are tired of being bullied by developers come forward and voice their concerns. Why would the situation with this project be any different? The precedent established heretofore is incontrovertible.

Your office and the City Council has routinely capitulated to developers flashing money before your eyes, all the while summarily dismissing the communities those developers are steamrolling. We all know the only reason you solicit public input is because you are required to by law and it's too difficult to sidestep that process without getting caught and suffering severe consequences as a result. If you had your way you'd eliminate all public input and just do whatever you want, which is essentially what you do now by just ignoring us. Your office made it abundantly clear they were nothing but irritated with our input when 97% of our entire community vehemently objected to a plan NES forced on us against our will. I have every confidence citizen input will yet again be ignored for this project. "Community involvement" is irrefutably an absolute farce.

The stench of corruption perennially lingers in your and the City Council's offices. You let obviously commercial developers buy residential property, then get it rezoned to commercial status. This has happened time and time again, saving those precious developers millions by not having to pay commercial real estate prices. This Hope Chapel project is another perfect example. It's a commercial

operation (multi-family housing) masquerading as a church. The developer bribed the city by “donating” a church in exchange for project approval of a commercial endeavor on residential land. If that’s not quid pro quo I don’t know what is. It’s so shady it deserves federal investigation.

That ridiculously ill-conceived project will absolutely snarl traffic in the immediate area, but no one in your office cares. Just add some turning lanes and a new traffic light. Problem solved. Real world result? The people who because of heavy and speeding Old Ranch traffic already can’t get out of the Springcrest subdivision to turn west on Old Ranch will have to wait even longer now, especially when school is in session for 8 months out of the year and cars are backed up 10 deep on Otero. Clearly, no one in your office has spent any time at that intersection watching the traffic build up on Otero at school and morning commute times, or watching people screaming down Old Ranch past that intersection, or watching how suddenly and unexpectedly eastbound speeding cars crest the blind hill just west of that intersection, or watching impatient road-raging morons try to pass other cars on the narrow 2-lane bridge over Kettle Creek.

We already have a problem with parents careening through the Springcrest neighborhood on Otero at 10-15 mph above the posted speed limit. Now you want to put a traffic light at Old Ranch and Otero so those same westbound idiots wanting to turn south on Otero are forced to wait to do so, which just pisses them off even more, so they drive that much faster through our neighborhood (which has no sidewalks) to drop their kids off at the elementary school. Now they’re 2 minutes later to work because they’re too damn lazy to plan accordingly, so they haul ass back down Otero to Old Ranch. WE LIVE HERE. We see it EVERY DAY. Your office is pitifully incapable of managing the road-raging results of your incompetent and/or dismissive planning. We’ve already had one neighbor hit by a speeding and inattentive carpool Mom who was just “too rushed” one afternoon to pay attention to the community she speeds through every day. Approval of this sham of a project will only make it worse, and anyone that gets run over by one of these reckless drivers will be on your hands because you were repeatedly warned of the consequences of poor judgement, yet chose to worship developer money over public input and public safety.

To make matters worse, every idea we come up with to try and mitigate the disastrous results of your office’s poor planning (i.e., more reckless traffic being funneled into our peaceful, rural residential community) gets denied by one official or another. “We’re gonna f’ up your neighborhood and there’s nothing you can do about it.”

We’ve seen the pattern all too frequently. The developer spends lots of money to come up with an invasive, unscrupulous and hair-brained plan and the City obsequiously acquiesces because “it wouldn’t be fair” to deny the plan after they invested so much, no matter how disastrous the project’s impact on a community. No one thinks those developers would even go that far unless the City already told them, long before any public input was begrudgingly solicited, they would get the green light to start drafting up plans.

The real insult is how much emphasis the “review” process then puts on ridiculously trivial things like a missing comma, or un-capitalized headings, or other totally BS “requirements”, yet incredibly valid and insightful public input is summarily ignored and relegated to an appendix of required content. The malfeasance of public officials and obscene deference to money-waving developers is blatantly transparent to all of us, and the consistent reply we get is patronizing dismissals of our concerns. “Your input is considered along with the developer’s”. That’s clearly BS. “You can vote or get involved in the process.” No, we can’t, because we live in the county and the city keeps stealing our land and annexing it so their precious developers can have it at residential rates. “You can make your voice heard at public input meetings.” We’ve done that and were summarily treated like pests. Furthermore, we sometimes find out about a “public” meeting after it already happened. How sleazy is that? Did someone

“accidentally” forget to send out the required notices? Did more bribes or “donations” get paid to keep the meeting secret so only the developer had the ear of decision-makers?

I’ve read all the other comments attached to this proposed project and they’re all full of platitudes like “please” and “if you’d be so kind” and “with all due respect”. Your office and the City Council deserve *no respect whatsoever* because of how citizen input is habitually ignored in favor of developers like NES. Anyone voting in favor of yet another corrupt, atrocious debacle like this has no conscience. They are a sellout to money at the expense of families who have to live with the consequences. We are thoroughly ashamed of you and your pandering to influencers. You claim to know what’s best for the community, but *we are the community* and *we* know what’s in our best interest. Approving this project just cements the city’s legacy of being owned by developers. The people who make up Colorado Springs are thus nuisances who get in the way of those in power who have no conscience. Except for having met my wife here, I now fully regret having moved to Colorado Springs in 1997. I feel sorry for the lifetime residents who have watched a once beautiful and peaceful city let its public officials get so willingly hypnotized and overrun by shallow developer money. It’s an absolute disgrace, with no end in sight.

Your dishonor will live on forever.

Most Disrespectfully,

Brian FASTERLING

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Michele Clapper <shellbug9@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 3, 2022 12:37 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G; AllCouncil@springsgov.com
Subject: Hope Chapel Annexation and Development

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

I strongly urge you and City Council to adhere to your own Traffic Engineering Department recommendation, as this development does not want to be responsible for the potential traffic concerns many neighbors (taxpaying citizens) are expressing. I copied these from the 'Review Letter'.

Traffic Engineering (Zaker Alazzeah, 719-385-5468)

1. Per the Traffic Criteria Manual, the proposed private site access with Old Ranch Road shall intersect at ninety degree angle.
2. Please add the following note to the development plan, " The developer will be responsible to construct an eastbound left turn lane at the proposed site access along Old Ranch Road. This turn lane will need to be 200 feet in length with 180 feet taper." This will require the construction of a westbound left turn lane at Old Ranch Road/Otero Avenue intersection.
3. The developer shall dedicate approximately 13 feet of ROW along the southern lot side on Old Ranch Road.

As well as comments from:

Engineering Development Review (Joel Dagnillo, 719-385-5412)

4. Concur with the following Traffic Engineering comment: Please add the following note to the development plan, "The developer will be responsible to construct an eastbound left turn lane at the proposed site access along Old Ranch Road. This turn lane will need to be 200 feet in length with 180 feet taper." This will require the construction of a westbound left turn lane at Old Ranch Road/Otero Avenue intersection.

Further east of Otero Ave., on Old Ranch Road, just past the bridge, Old Ranch Road has been widened and left turn lanes added (both eastbound and westbound) to accommodate access to the neighborhoods without stopping traffic. There are right ingress lanes, as well. As you travel further east, Old Ranch becomes two lanes in either direction, with right ingress lanes and left turning lanes, and a traffic light to allow traffic from the neighborhoods to turn left, right, or pass through Old Ranch Road. Approving this development, adding 100 units with more than likely 2 cars per unit, not to mention the traffic from the church, absolutely deserves the same type of intersection as the ones further east. There are developments further east, on the east side of Powers, that use Old Ranch Road, and there are 4 schools in the area that generate traffic.

Concept Plan Review Criteria (Section 7.5.501) A. WILL THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT UPON THE GENERAL HEALTH, WELFARE AND SAFETY OR CONVENIENCE OF PERSONS RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT?

A development that would only benefit from their endeavor and not give back to the community in the form of paying for the traffic nightmare it will cause, should not be allowed. Why should we, as taxpayers, constantly end up paying for the problems and safety issues that occur after the developer is long gone? The amount of traffic trying to enter and exit

the development with no right ingress and no left turning lanes, is an absolute safety issue. If you are traveling west on Old Ranch, and you need to turn left on Otero, (to the neighborhood where I live), you are looking at a blind hill, and you see the cars traveling east very last minute, and you have cars stopped behind you (because you don't have a left turning lane), it becomes a safety issue. If, in addition to all that, there are cars trying to get in or out of the development, it becomes a safety and convenience issue. While this is all happening, the only traffic control in sight is a stop sign on Otero Ave for Otero Ave.

Again, I would urge you to adhere to the recommendations of your traffic engineering department, and the concerns of taxpaying citizens who live here. If this developer refuses to adhere to this requirement, I feel this development should be denied.

Donna Michele Clapper
Concerned Citizen

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Michele Clapper <shellbug9@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 8, 2022 2:16 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G
Subject: RE: Hope Chapel Annexation and Development

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

I have a few questions. What is the requirement for a left turn lane? Who determines whether or not a left turn lane is required? Has this been determined before the Traffic Engineering and Engineering Development review? When is the conclusion of the review cycle?

Thank you,

D. Michele Clapper

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

From: [Sevigny, Gabe G](#)
Sent: Tuesday, July 5, 2022 2:12 PM
To: [Michele Clapper](#)
Subject: RE: Hope Chapel Annexation and Development

Hello,

Thank you for the email. It will be a part of public record and forwarded to the applicant for their opportunity to respond or acknowledge after this review cycle. As someone who has emailed me, I will email you when a resubmittal has been made and any public hearing that is scheduled, and also any decision that is made and the appeal instructions. Please note, the project is not scheduled at this time for a public hearing. Also note, the resubmittal will have additional round of comments from both Traffic Engineering and Engineering Development Review. At this time, the applicant has reduced the number of units, therefore reducing traffic to and from the site. The reduction has removed the requirement of the left turn lane. The updated review letter will be posted on the link below at the conclusion of this review cycle. Please let me know if you have any additional questions in the meantime.



Gabe Sevigny
Planning Supervisor
Land Use Review Division
City of Colorado Springs
Office: (719) 385-5088
Email: Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov

Links:

[Planning & Community Development Home](#)
[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#)

 Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.

From: Michele Clapper <shellbug9@hotmail.com>

Sent: Sunday, July 3, 2022 12:37 PM

To: Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov>; AllCouncil@springsgov.com

Subject: Hope Chapel Annexation and Development

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

I strongly urge you and City Council to adhere to your own Traffic Engineering Department recommendation, as this development does not want to be responsible for the potential traffic concerns many neighbors (taxpaying citizens) are expressing. I copied these from the 'Review Letter'.

Traffic Engineering (Zaker Alazzeah, 719-385-5468)

1. Per the Traffic Criteria Manual, the proposed private site access with Old Ranch Road shall intersect at ninety degree angle.
2. Please add the following note to the development plan, " The developer will be responsible to construct an eastbound left turn lane at the proposed site access along Old Ranch Road. This turn lane will need to be 200 feet in length with 180 feet taper." This will require the construction of a westbound left turn lane at Old Ranch Road/Otero Avenue intersection.
3. The developer shall dedicate approximately 13 feet of ROW along the southern lot side on Old Ranch Road.

As well as comments from:

Engineering Development Review (Joel Dagnillo, 719-385-5412)

4. Concur with the following Traffic Engineering comment: Please add the following note to the development plan, "The developer will be responsible to construct an eastbound left turn lane at the proposed site access along Old Ranch Road. This turn lane will need to be 200 feet in length with 180 feet taper." This will require the construction of a westbound left turn lane at Old Ranch Road/Otero Avenue intersection.

Further east of Otero Ave., on Old Ranch Road, just past the bridge, Old Ranch Road has been widened and left turn lanes added (both eastbound and westbound) to accommodate access to the neighborhoods without stopping traffic. There are right ingress lanes, as well. As you travel further east, Old Ranch becomes two lanes in either direction, with right ingress lanes and left turning lanes, and a traffic light to allow traffic from the neighborhoods to turn left, right, or pass through Old Ranch Road. Approving this development, adding 100 units with more than likely 2 cars per unit, not to mention the traffic from the church, absolutely deserves the same type of intersection as the ones further east. There are developments further east, on the east side of Powers, that use Old Ranch Road, and there are 4 schools in the area that generate traffic.

Concept Plan Review Criteria (Section 7.5.501) A. WILL THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT HAVE A DETRIMENTAL EFFECT UPON THE GENERAL HEALTH, WELFARE AND SAFETY OR CONVENIENCE OF PERSONS RESIDING OR WORKING IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT?

A development that would only benefit from their endeavor and not give back to the community in the form of paying for the traffic nightmare it will cause, should not be allowed. Why should we, as taxpayers, constantly end up paying for the problems and safety issues that occur after the developer is long gone? The amount of traffic trying to enter and exit the development with no right ingress and no left turning lanes, is an absolute safety issue. If you are traveling west on Old Ranch, and you need to turn left on Otero, (to the neighborhood where I live), you are looking at a blind hill, and you see the cars traveling east very last minute, and you have cars stopped behind you (because you don't have a left turning lane), it becomes a safety issue. If, in addition to all that, there are cars trying to get in or out of the development, it becomes a safety and convenience issue. While this is all happening, the only traffic control in sight is a stop sign on Otero Ave for Otero Ave.

Again, I would urge you to adhere to the recommendations of your traffic engineering department, and the concerns of taxpaying citizens who live here. If this developer refuses to adhere to this requirement, I feel this development should be denied.

Donna Michele Clapper
Concerned Citizen

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Sevigny, Gabe G

From: Sevigny, Gabe G
Sent: Wednesday, January 4, 2023 12:03 PM
To: Maureen Kirchdoerfer
Subject: RE: Hope Chapel Annexations No. 1&2: AGAINST

Hello,

Thank you for the email. It will be forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council for their review of the proposed annexation. Please note that Colorado Springs Utilities are an outside agency who reviews projects. They have no remaining issues with the proposal. Any future development will still require a development plan with construction drawings to be approved by CSU prior to any construction, and a final drainage report. Any pre-existing flow is still required to be met. The Department of the Interior was an outside agency for review. They have provided a statement that this development would not have a negative impact on the local wildlife. Finally, staff supports the use of a townhome development as a transition from the single-family to the east and the higher density to the west. The annexation would also annex a remainder piece of Old Ranch Road that has been annexed on both sides to the east and west, therefore providing a logical extension to City boundaries. That being said, Planning Commission is a recommending body that can provide a recommendation of approval or denial to City Council. City Council will be the final action. Please let me know if you have any further questions.



Gabe Sevigny
Planning Supervisor
Land Use Review Division
City of Colorado Springs
Office: (719) 385-5088
Email: Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov

Links:

[Planning & Community Development Home](#)

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

From: Maureen Kirchdoerfer <ReleaseMeCreations@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, January 3, 2023 6:34 PM
To: Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Hope Chapel Annexations No. 1&2: AGAINST

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

I am AGAINST this project for the Multi Family Housing (apartments). I see no issue with the Chapel going in, but am AGAINST any multi family housing going in this area.

BIGGEST REASON FOR MY NO VOTE: THERE IS CLOSE TO NO WATER LEFT FOR THE RESIDENTS OF COLORADO SPRINGS. We are nearing a water crisis. I know it, the city council knows it, the city officials in probably every capacity know it. There should not be any more building of Multi Family, or really any more new housing built due to this MAJOR reason. If this building continues, ushering in more and more people who use more and more water, the next few massive droughts that happen will most certainly trigger a 100% full-blown water crisis, as in there is no water left. One look at Rampart Reservoir over the summer and this was completely evident. I'm glad this will be going on the record as I will be saving it if indeed the rampant unchecked housing/multi family housing continues, including this multi family project. It will certainly be important to show the negligence and blatant disregard for the health, safety and well-being of the residents of Colorado Springs when there is literally no water available and it is due to the unchecked building done in spite of knowing this problem.

Secondary Reasons: 1) It is an inappropriate area, right up against people in single family homes who sought this area out to get away from the big apartment buildings. Keep the apartments over close to 25, and the businesses on Interquest. This is not the place for this type of building, and if we're being honest the building should be halted completely due to the above stated reason.

2)Runoff- there is a creek right there. This will cause pollution and unnecessary runoff affecting not only the water in the creek but the environment around it and the animals and organisms who depend on it

3) Displacement of animals who currently use this space as habitat. There is zero open space that has been left by the rampant unchecked building and it makes me sick. This used to be homes for thousands of animals and human greed has destroyed basically all of it. It needs to stop.

NO BUILDING MULTI FAMILY HOUSING!