

## Sevigny, Gabe G

---

**From:** Sevigny, Gabe G  
**Sent:** Monday, January 9, 2023 8:16 AM  
**To:** Brian Fasterling  
**Subject:** RE: Hope Chapel Annexation

Hello,

Thank you again for the email, and apologies for the delayed response. Your email will be added to the packet for Planning Commission and City Council to review. I would also encourage you to be present for Planning Commission to hear your concerns. Please note that I can address the maximum number of units. That while the proposal is for straight zoning of R5, the concept plan is for a maximum of 100 units. If the applicant were to change the layout or increase the units, then an amendment to the concept plan would be required. If the units were to increase, this would change the current submitted traffic study, and an updated study would be required. Any of these changes are subject to neighbor notification and posters on the property. Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Fasterling <waskulywabut@q.com>  
Sent: Friday, January 6, 2023 12:57 PM  
To: Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov>  
Subject: Re: 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!

I didn't say there was an environmental impact or code violation in this particular case. I'm referring to what our neighborhood to the south experienced directly with respect to how the Planning Commission and the City Council operate. Developers get their way unless public outrage becomes too embarrassing (or unless someone on the City Council is directly and negatively impacted by the plan and thus votes against it).

We know someone who knows the land owner quite well, and they were told the project had a much higher chance of being approved if it was touted as a chapel that happens to also have multi-family housing on the land. The land owner also said their real intent all along was to develop multi-family housing, so they pitched the plan as "donating" a chapel as part of the process in order to sweeten the deal and make it look more palatable to the public. No one wants to be on

record voting against a church, so they made "Hope Chapel" the primary moniker and hoped people wouldn't really pay attention to the multi-family part.

Furthermore, if this is being run by NES Development, we know firsthand they are liars, and when that was pointed out to the City Council Richard Skorman said that only really mattered if they lied on paper. The developer may very well promise to build only 100 units, then will build 120 instead. NES did something similar down the street. They promised something that "maintained the character of the neighborhood", then built something even a third grader would say is totally out of character with the neighborhood. No one from the City cared when that was pointed out. Certainly NES is not the only developer that operates this way.

Regarding the traffic, the city traffic engineering department doesn't live here. They don't sit at Old Rand and Otero trying to get out of the neighborhood with the traffic that's already there, much less when there are 100 more units, and thus at least 100 more cars, across the street. They also said there would be no traffic impact from the 2424 GOTG project where hundreds of apartment units were planned. That garnered them widespread ridicule, so the traffic department doesn't have much credibility.

The point of all this is our Springcrest community is under threat, and has been treated like garbage from both the Planning Commission and the City Council. The Peaks Recovery and Hope Chapel development plans have now drawn further and further unwanted attention to our once unknown neighborhood. Developers are salivating over our "wasted" acreage and soliciting us to sell out to them so they can admittedly tear down our homes and build more apartment complexes. The more commercial and/or multi-family projects that get approved on our perimeter the more we feel threatened and backed into a corner, and that won't turn out well given the fierce desire of this entire subdivision to fight back. Even if we have covenants that specifically prohibit any sort of commercial or multi-family activity in this area, our "inside sources" have confirmed both the the Planning Commission and the City Council will absolutely refuse to take that into consideration when evaluating development plans. This means any aggressive and intrusive developer like NES will be allowed to buy out a neighbor and bankrupt any HOA into submission, all with the "blind eye" blessing of the City.

Given all of that, you tell me and this entire neighborhood why there should be any credibility offered towards, or why we should ever have any faith and trust in, how your office and/or the City Council operates.

Brian Fasterling

On Jan 6, 2023, at 11:28 AM, Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

Thank you for your email. Your email is a part of the public record and will be available for the Planning Commission and City Council to review.

Apologies that there seems to be some miscommunication to the proposal, I will try to resolve below:

As mentioned throughout this process, the proposal is for multi-family and for a religious institution, I am not sure where any miscommunication has come from in that regard. That proposal is what has been on postcards, and on the poster, as well as identified on the concept plan available online for public view. Can you please provide clarification to the statement that the City said there is a negative environmental impact? The Department of the Interior has provided a letter that is contrary to that statement. I have no other comments about negative environmental impacts.

Also, for the widening of Old Ranch Road for a turn lane, the initial proposal was for 120 units which would trigger for those requirements. This was identified in the traffic study from the applicant's traffic engineer and then reviewed by the City Traffic Engineering to be acceptable. However, the applicant then chose to reduce the number to 100 units therefore, removing such requirements. The updated traffic report has been reviewed and accepted by Traffic

Engineering. Please clarify which City agencies have indicated a negative impact as again, I do not have any such comments.

The proposal has been reviewed to City Code and there are no outstanding issues. A townhome type development is a transition from the single-family dwellings to the east and the office/higher density development to the west. The annexation also includes a remaining section of Old Ranch Road that was previously to be owned and maintained by the County that would be owned and maintained by the City. If there are improvements required, those would be at the cost of the developer as the annexation agreement discusses. The annexation is voluntary, and is considered a Near Enclave. A Near Enclave shows characteristics of an enclave as the area to the north, east, and south are City limits, with the Air Force Academy to the west of I25. The Air Force Academy would not be anticipated to ever annex, therefore, leaving this site as showing characteristics of an enclave. City Code supports the elimination of enclaves as it helps with utility extensions and maintenance of right-of-way.

An approval of the annexation does not approve building or land disturbance, it would allow the applicant to further request a development plan and final plat. Those applications would identify further, the required public improvements that would be at the cost of the developer.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance, if you would rather have a phone call, or if you would like in-person meeting prior to the public hearing. Have a great weekend.

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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian Fasterling <waskulywabut@q.com>  
Sent: Friday, January 6, 2023 10:54 AM  
To: Sevigny, Gabe G <Gabe.Sevigny@coloradosprings.gov>  
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!

To Gabe Sevigny and All of the City Planning Commission:

What a friggin' joke your sign is, asking for public comments on this project. There is absolutely no one in the affected area that thinks there is any value in expressing their objections to your obscenely transparent "developers get what developers want" project approval process. Your office has repeatedly made abundantly clear public input is thoroughly ignored, if not outright despised, so putting up such a sign achieves nothing but knowingly and gleefully rubbing our noses in the fecal pile of an approval process you manage.

No matter what zoning laws or city codes are being violated, your office finds a way to say they don't apply. No matter what objections are raised, your office finds a way to say they aren't merited. If the City says there is a negative environmental impact, your office ignores that and accepts the opinion the developer bought that says otherwise. If the City says there will be a negative impact on local traffic and demands turning lanes or wider roads, your office ignores that and accepts the opinion the developer bought that says otherwise. No matter what the better-informed local area or the City's own experts say, your office routinely capitulates and acquiesces to whatever contrary paid opinion the developer proffers.

Our entire neighborhood has personally been subjected to the highly unprofessional, infantile, rude and condescending attitude of your office, merely for trying to protect our cherished community from aggressive and unwanted commercial intrusions. Your office's reply? "Stick it. We don't care. Now go away." It's absolutely mind-boggling how you can continue to voluntarily be a part of such a despicable public office. You clearly have no shame and no moral compass.

We've established a "back channel" contact within the City Council who tells us what you don't want the public to know, and it's obscene how corrupt the project approval process is. Developers totally run your office and the City Council, and you just willingly continue to bend over and take it. How utterly pathetic, and you folks wonder why you earn absolutely zero respect from the citizens (or more likely you already know why and simply don't care).

This project is so obviously a multi-family apartment project sneaking in under the radar as a church. How morally and religiously defensible is that? It's a total disgrace, and if anyone in your office had any true integrity they'd be mortified to be associated with bulldozing this project through. What an unfettered embarrassment all of you must be to your families, and to God himself when you sit in church and try to act pious while you ask for his forgiveness for your atrocious public service sins.

Brian FASTERLING

## Sevigny, Gabe G

---

**From:** Sevigny, Gabe G  
**Sent:** Friday, January 6, 2023 11:28 AM  
**To:** Brian FASTERLING  
**Subject:** RE: Hope Chapel Annexation

Hello,

Thank you for your email. Your email is a part of the public record and will be available for the Planning Commission and City Council to review.

Apologies that there seems to be some miscommunication to the proposal, I will try to resolve below:

As mentioned throughout this process, the proposal is for multi-family and for a religious institution, I am not sure where any miscommunication has come from in that regard. That proposal is what has been on postcards, and on the poster, as well as identified on the concept plan available online for public view. Can you please provide clarification to the statement that the City said there is a negative environmental impact? The Department of the Interior has provided a letter that is contrary to that statement. I have no other comments about negative environmental impacts.

Also, for the widening of Old Ranch Road for a turn lane, the initial proposal was for 120 units which would trigger for those requirements. This was identified in the traffic study from the applicant's traffic engineer and then reviewed by the City Traffic Engineering to be acceptable. However, the applicant then chose to reduce the number to 100 units therefore, removing such requirements. The updated traffic report has been reviewed and accepted by Traffic Engineering. Please clarify which City agencies have indicated a negative impact as again, I do not have any such comments.

The proposal has been reviewed to City Code and there are no outstanding issues. A townhome type development is a transition from the single-family dwellings to the east and the office/higher density development to the west. The annexation also includes a remaining section of Old Ranch Road that was previously to be owned and maintained by the County that would be owned and maintained by the City. If there are improvements required, those would be at the cost of the developer as the annexation agreement discusses. The annexation is voluntary, and is considered a Near Enclave. A Near Enclave shows characteristics of an enclave as the area to the north, east, and south are City limits, with the Air Force Academy to the west of I25. The Air Force Academy would not be anticipated to ever annex, therefore, leaving this site as showing characteristics of an enclave. City Code supports the elimination of enclaves as it helps with utility extensions and maintenance of right-of-way.

An approval of the annexation does not approve building or land disturbance, it would allow the applicant to further request a development plan and final plat. Those applications would identify further, the required public improvements that would be at the cost of the developer.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance, if you would rather have a phone call, or if you would like in-person meeting prior to the public hearing. Have a great weekend.

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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Brian FASTERLING <waskulywabut@q.com>

Sent: Friday, January 6, 2023 10:54 AM

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

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!

To Gabe Sevigny and All of the City Planning Commission:

What a friggin' joke your sign is, asking for public comments on this project. There is absolutely no one in the affected area that thinks there is any value in expressing their objections to your obscenely transparent "developers get what developers want" project approval process. Your office has repeatedly made abundantly clear public input is thoroughly ignored, if not outright despised, so putting up such a sign achieves nothing but knowingly and gleefully rubbing our noses in the fecal pile of an approval process you manage.

No matter what zoning laws or city codes are being violated, your office finds a way to say they don't apply. No matter what objections are raised, your office finds a way to say they aren't merited. If the City says there is a negative environmental impact, your office ignores that and accepts the opinion the developer bought that says otherwise. If the City says there will be a negative impact on local traffic and demands turning lanes or wider roads, your office ignores that and accepts the opinion the developer bought that says otherwise. No matter what the better-informed local area or the City's own experts say, your office routinely capitulates and acquiesces to whatever contrary paid opinion the developer proffers.

Our entire neighborhood has personally been subjected to the highly unprofessional, infantile, rude and condescending attitude of your office, merely for trying to protect our cherished community from aggressive and unwanted commercial intrusions. Your office's reply? "Stick it. We don't care. Now go away." It's absolutely mind-boggling how you can continue to voluntarily be a part of such a despicable public office. You clearly have no shame and no moral compass.

We've established a "back channel" contact within the City Council who tells us what you don't want the public to know, and it's obscene how corrupt the project approval process is. Developers totally run your office and the City Council, and you just willingly continue to bend over and take it. How utterly pathetic, and you folks wonder why you earn absolutely zero respect from the citizens (or more likely you already know why and simply don't care).

This project is so obviously a multi-family apartment project sneaking in under the radar as a church. How morally and religiously defensible is that? It's a total disgrace, and if anyone in your office had any true integrity they'd be mortified to be associated with bulldozing this project through. What an unfettered embarrassment all of you must be to your families, and to God himself when you sit in church and try to act pious while you ask for his forgiveness for your atrocious public service sins.

Brian FASTERLING