

Turisk, Michael

From: Ellen Johnson-Fay <ellenjf@q.com>
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2016 2:42 PM
To: welling clark
Cc: James Thompson; Maren McDowell; Linda Schlarb; Welling Clark (w); Bonnie Lapora; Mary Gallivan; Chad White; Terry Brunette; Turisk, Michael
Subject: Re: CPC PFP 16-00054 - 543 Robbin Place

I admit I'm against new home building - better to use the space for a community garden!
A public meeting sounds like a good plan.

Thanks,
Ellen

The Rev. Dr. Ellen Johnson-Fay
Minister Emerita All Souls Unitarian Universalist Church
719-473-7059
ellenjf@q.com

What I want is so simple I almost can't say it: elementary kindness. Enough to eat, enough to go around. The possibility that one day kids might grow up to be neither the destroyer nor the destroyed.
- Barbara Kingsolver

On May 2, 2016, at 7:43 AM, welling clark <welling80904@yahoo.com> wrote:

OWN board FYI. think we are going to need a public meeting for this proposed development. 3 duplexes inserted into a group of single family structures.

Michael - Has the surrounding public been notified of this proposed development? Does the developer has a site plan that the residents can examine to allay compatibility fears? Off street parking is always a concern when population density is increased.

Well

<datauri-file.png>

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: "Hurst, Cynthia" <churst@springsgov.com>
To: "rhoover.cos@comcast.net" <rhoover.cos@comcast.net>; "Bea.Romero@qwest.com" <Bea.Romero@qwest.com>; "Quinn, Chris (CSU)" <cquinn@csu.org>; "English, Bryan (CSU)" <benglish@csu.org>; "Jones, Bootsy" <bjones2@springsgov.com>; "Lieber, Christian" <clieber@springsgov.com>; "Perry, Connie" <CPerry@springsgov.com>; "michaela@pprbd.org" <michaela@pprbd.org>; "addressing@pprbd.org" <addressing@pprbd.org>; "addressing@pprbd.org"

<addressing@pprbd.org>; "addressing@pprbd.org" <addressing@pprbd.org>; "elaine.f.medina@usps.gov" <elaine.f.medina@usps.gov>; "Alazzeh, Zaker" <zalazzeh@springsgov.com>; "Huggins, Terry" <thuggins@springsgov.com>; "Karr, Kim" <kkarr@springsgov.com>; "Zurcher, Christoph" <CZurcher@springsgov.com>; "Austin, Roger" <RAustin@springsgov.com>; "celestegleason@elpasoco.com" <celestegleason@elpasoco.com>; "aarondoussett@elpasoco.com" <aarondoussett@elpasoco.com>; "Cooper, Jeff" <jcooper@springsgov.com>; "dale_stewart@cable.comcast.com" <dale_stewart@cable.comcast.com>; "Micheal_Ruff@cable.comcast.com" <Micheal_Ruff@cable.comcast.com>; "info@westsideneighbors.org" <info@westsideneighbors.org>; "welling80904@yahoo.com" <welling80904@yahoo.com>; "editor@westsidepioneer.com" <editor@westsidepioneer.com>; "chad@paradigmrealestate.net" <chad@paradigmrealestate.net>; "seanchambers77@gmail.com" <seanchambers77@gmail.com>; "welling.clark@harris.com" <welling.clark@harris.com>
Cc: "Turisk, Michael" <Mturisk@springsgov.com>
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 3:38 PM
Subject: CPC PFP 16-00054 - 543 Robbin Place

<image001.gif>

Good Afternoon,

Please find attached the buckslip for the **543 Robbin Place. Comments due by May 11, 2016.**

Because you are on the Electronic Buckslip recipient list, you will no longer be receiving hard copies of the buckslip, project statement or plan(s). In order to access the site needed to view the electronic version of the application, project statement and/or plan(s), please follow these steps:

1. Go to <http://eoc.springsgov.com/ldrs/>
2. Type in the file number.
3. Click "Run Query".
4. Click on the "Document" link next to the Initial Application to view the application and the project statement.
5. Click on the "Document" link next to the drawings that were submitted.

Please provide ANY and ALL comments to the planner, **Michael Turisk** at mturisk@springsgov.com. **Do not reply to this email address.**

Thank you

Cindy Hurst
Senior Office Specialist
Planning and Community Development
(719) 385-5351
churst@springsgov.com

<image003.jpg>

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in or attached to this electronic message is privileged/confidential and intended only for the use of the individual(s) named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please inform the sender immediately and remove/delete any record of this message.

<CPC PFP 16-00054-BSLIP.pdf><datauri-file.png><image003.jpg><image001.gif>

Turisk, Michael

From: James Thompson <thompson.jamesii@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2016 8:23 AM
To: Turisk, Michael
Subject: CPC-PFP 16-00054

Morning Michael,

My name is Jim Thompson and I sit on the board for OWN. I have been informed by some of our neighbors that they have concerns about the above-referenced proposed project. The OWN board has requested that we have a public meeting regarding this project. Can you inform me what steps need to be taken to allow this process to occur? Thanks in advance for your consideration.

Regards,
Jim Thompson
OWN - Secretary

Turisk, Michael

From: ROSELLA I PADILLA Owner <ripadilla@q.com>
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2016 3:41 PM
To: Turisk, Michael
Subject: 543 Robin Pl

Hi Michael,

I want to give my feedback on his proposed duplex going up. I am against it 100%.

I will be impacted greatly. I live on the corner house and the alley is a nightmare right now.

It is only wide enough for one car. Cars speed down the alley with no regards to me pulling in or out or people walking or cleaning up their yards.

You have to pull far out into the street to see if cars are coming to get access out to Boulder or St Vrain

There is no way fire dept or emergency vehicles can get into the alley.

The dirt and hill are eroding and who's to say there will not be mudslides/landslides.

Utility lines and electric lines would need to be all done. And the street paved and widened and there is no room to widen.

The alley is just gravel and not a street.

There is not ample parking right now much less for that many units going up.

This is a nice quiet neighborhood and we dont need the hassles of rentals and people coming and going and all the activity.

We all are homeowners and like our peace and quiet and we all get along.

I thought the land was zoned for wildlife conservation, how can it be zoned for residential. We have alot of deer in the area that eat the weeds and keep them chopped down.

Please consider our feedback. We all care a great deal about our properties and where we live.

Any question please contact me.

Turisk, Michael

From: Bettina Young <young.b.tina@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2016 7:10 PM
To: Turisk, Michael
Subject: 543 Robbin Place, Col. Spr. 80905

Dear
Mr. Michael Turisk,

I am writing regards to 543 Robbin Place, 80905. File No. :CPC PFP 16-00054 and File NO. : CPC SWP 16-00057.

I live across the alley on 519 W. Boulder St.
and am the homeowner of this property.

My concerns are building on this hillside 0.5 acres multiple lots with duplexes will implement serious problems.

The hillsides soil composition is not stable to support this kind of project. Our houses experience shifting of the soil yearly. The city has been already having dangerous landslides happening in Colorado Springs.

We have neighbor kids that use the sidewalk for driving their bikes often. This would not be save for them anymore with the alley being used as a street.

There is no way to use this alley as a street going both directions at the same time.

There is only space for one vehicle at a time.

Today the fire departments truck could not fit

driving through the alley. How would that be save with multiple units living, since police and fire trucks have no space for emergencies? There is no stop sign or light!

Parking is also a big concern. How is this small lot supporting 2 cars for every duplex and visitors without affecting our street parking on Boulder St?

If there would be more traffic using this alley I might get hit coming out of my driveway. It is very close. It is already very hard to maneuver out with all the parked cars on each streetside.

There is also the question of what would happen with the other 4 lots. since there is only mentioned about two of six?

I would like to ask for the Traffic Study Report, the Drainage Report, the Geo-Technical Hazards Report and the Waste Water Facilities Water Report. They were not provided.

I can not see with all these issues listed that the city could promote this project for the health, safety, convenience and general welfare of the citizens of this city.

Sincerely

Bettina Young

Turisk, Michael

From: Johnny OZ <23papajohn@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 3:45 PM
To: Turisk, Michael
Subject: file no: cpc pfp 16-00054 and file no: cpc swp 16-00057

My wife and I reside at 420 Cooper Avenue, 80905. Our back yard and garage access are on the alley which you refer to as 543 Robbin Place. We have deep concerns about the proposed plans to construct multiple duplexes on said property. Please keep us informed as to any future developments or plans for citizen input concerning this issue.

Turisk, Michael

From: Mary Wachtel-Mallinger <marymallie@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, May 28, 2016 9:39 AM
To: Turisk, Michael
Subject: File No: CAC PFP 16-00054 and File No: CAC SWP 16-00057

Mr. Michael Truisk, Planner II:

This email is in response to the above File No's regarding building plans located at 543 Robbin Place. First, I will mention that the so named "Robbin Place" is actually an Alley excess. The Alley excess is not designed for traffic. It is certainly not wide enough to accommodate passing cars, trucks, etc.

My husband and I live on Cooper Avenue - just east of the "Alley Road". Our garage opens up to the alley so it is virtually the in-and-out access to our home. With the proposed building, I will state that this would be very dangerous not only to vehicles, but people, children, and animals. There just isn't enough room to accommodate more vehicles and traffic.

Regarding these proposed plans, my husband and I are opposed to any and all building in this area. Should more information be forthcoming, we will definitely voice our opinions.

Thank you.

John and Mary Osborn
420 Cooper Avenue
Colorado Springs, CO 80905

July 14, 2016

Michael Turist
Planner II
City Of Colorado Springs, Land Use Division
30 S. Nevada #105
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80905

Dear Mr. Turist,

My name is Autumn Vytorek and I live at 408
Cooper Ave 80905

As a west side resident, I have some concerns about
the Tobler Place duplex development plans.

- Safety Issues

I am concerned about the city fire department
not having fast and adequate access to the alley.
I witnessed the fire department truck having difficulty
turning into the alley from W. Boulder. There are no
hydrants in the alley.

- Land Slippage

I also have concerns about erosion and
possible landslide activity and possible flooding
that could be damaging to existing homes and
property.

Michael Turisk

Planner II

City of Colorado Springs, Land Use Review Division

30 S. Nevada #105

Colorado Springs, Colorado. 80903


- Traffic & Parking

I have concerns about current pedestrian use and how additional vehicular traffic and parking could create unsafe and noisy conditions.

I would respectfully ask the Planning Commission to take into consideration the concerns of the neighborhood and understand that duplexes built on this property are not in character with our westside neighborhood.

Thank You For Your Time
With This Matter

Anthony Vyzarek
408 Cooper Ave 80905
AVyzarek@gmail.com
719-964-5909



PO Box 6651
Colorado Springs, CO 80934
www.westsideneighbors.org info@westsideneighbors.org

15 July 2016

RE: CPC PFP 16-00054 - 543 Robbin Place

Dear Planning Commission:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Robbin Place proposed development. Based on the neighborhood meeting discussions and resident feedback received, OWN respectfully presents some recommendations that address citizen concerns regarding approval of this development. It should be noted that OWN and neighboring residents do NOT oppose development; however there are concerns regarding this particular project that are particularly worrisome considering current Westside events.

OWN recommendations and issues for the proposed Robbin Place development:

- OWN recommends that **Hillside Overlay criteria and Westside Small Area Plan be used** for this development to ensure that the site integrity is maintained.
- Adjacent residents have strong concerns regarding **land slippage**. The steep slope has previously been thought to be undevelopable. The developer stated at the 14 June 2016 neighborhood meeting that support infrastructure will be completed to mitigate future landslides but this has not alleviated concerns. Our issues with this are as follows:
 1. **Land slippage is already occurring** on the Westside, in areas of existing structures and new construction sites. The picture below illustrates land slippage in a near-by neighborhood (Panorama Estates-east and Victorian Heights-west). Land slippage is occurring on the southeastern portion of the slope in Panorama Estates. The southwestern portion of the same slope is also suspect.



Same Slope – Southwestern Side
East Experiencing Land Slippage
Current **Panorama Estates** (east)

Figure 3 - emails

2. As recent as 28 June 2016, the Gazette reports of land slippage in the Skyway neighborhood (located on the Westside) and **City Council recommends reforms that will require Geo-hazard Reports, construction effects on surrounding properties**, and several other line items to prevent future slippage. Homes that have been damaged are scheduled, per FEMA requests, to be demolished.
 3. OWN recommends there be a **financial assurance bond posted during construction** and for a determined period after, so that no city tax dollars will be required for failure repairs due to unstable soils.
 4. OWN recommends that a **disclosure statement for landslide prone property** (similar to the one approved by Council on the Crown Hill Rockrimmon development) be required for homebuyers and future homebuyers of Robbin Place units.
 5. If excavations for the building sites trigger damage to adjoining uphill properties, **a legal entity shall be designated who will be held responsible for all repairs and replacement of property. Attachment A provides pictures of the property slope and visual characteristic.**
- There is an elevated fire risk for homes on the Westside, due to proximity to the mountains and the combustible construction of older homes. Through eye witnesses and city reports, a **fire truck cannot access the proposed site**, nor is there access to a fire hydrant. If the alley needs to be widened to grant access, adjacent structures and property will be affected and possibly require removal.
 - The assessor's records show the property sold in 2003 was approximately 14,000 SF. The current property is assessed at 24,000 SF. Why is there a discrepancy in property size?
 - The property is currently zoned R-2 which is consistent with the neighborhood. However, subdividing each lot would create (6) R-2 lots whose minimum lot size is less than the code requirement for R-2. Allowing R-2 zoning would permit future property owners to build an additional property on the already too-small lot, potentially doubling the density in this area beyond the congruent R-2 properties.
 - The developer stated they were open to including a provision in the land deed that would prohibit additional residential structures on the lot.
 - Several properties in the area do have two residences on an individual lot. However, to the best of our knowledge, **none of these properties are or plan to be subdivided** so that each property may be sold individually. This is the current intent of the applicant – to subdivide compliant R-2 lots so that each side of the duplex made be sold individually as if a n individual home. This is **not in character with the neighborhood**.
 - **OWN is strongly opposed** to creating smaller substandard sized R2 lots with properties straddling the property line (i.e., no set back back).
 - **OWN's concern** is that this type of development will be used by future developers to justify changing the current nature of the Westside into something that does not currently exist.
 - With the exception of one duplex, all other adjacent properties are single family homes. Duplexes are considered to be **not in character with the neighborhood. Attachment B provides pictures of the surrounding structures.**
 - These single family homes range in age – some built in the late 1800's to mid 1900's. OWN recommends adopting a style that blends with the unique character of these older homes and the surrounding neighborhood. Sources for this recommendation include:
 - The codified existing **Westside Plan** (which OWN has used in Land Use Review issues since 1980)
 - The non-codified **Westside Historic Guidelines** (a cooperative efforts between the City and OWN)

On behalf of our neighborhood organization and adjacent and nearby residents, we appreciate your consideration.

By Direction of the Board

Sincerely,

Well

Welling Clark

Welling Clark, OWN President

info@westsideneighbors.org (719) 661-8070

Cc: Mayor and Council of the City of Colorado Springs, CONO Exec Board

Attachment A: Property Slope Pictures



Figure 3 - emails

Attachment B: Surrounding Housing Structures




Figure 3 - emails

July 15, 2016

Michael Turisk
Planner II
City of Colorado Springs, Land Use Review Division
30 S. Nevada Avenue, #105
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Re: 543 Robbin Place

Dear Planning Commission:

My name is Dee Dengler and I live at 416 Cooper Avenue, Colorado Springs, CO 80905. My home is directly across the alley from this proposed development. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to make the following comments:

- Land slippage: Information from the Colorado Geological Survey dated May 19, 2016, states that this property should be considered an area susceptible to future landslide activity and has similar topography to areas that have had recent landslides. Being that my property would take a direct hit should this event happen, I would like to have a report on the construction effects on surrounding properties and exact mitigation that will be conducted to prevent a potential landslide. Also, assurance that a designated legal entity will be held responsible for all repairs/replacements for damages to my property due to such event.
- Emergency vehicle, specifically Fire Department, access to the site: City Chief Smith stated that the site cannot be accessed from the south with fire apparatus and that there is not a fire hydrant within regulation proximity. Eye witness reports support these statements. And, if the alley needs to be widened for emergency vehicle access, there is the possibility that property and structures on adjacent properties may need to be removed. Will the developer be responsible for replacement costs of said items?
- Design and construction of property: Will the design blend in with current homes? And comply with the codified existing Westside's Plan and non-codified Westside Historic Guidelines? With the exception of one duplex, all other adjacent properties are single family homes. Duplexes are not in character with neighborhood design, nor does the neighborhood wish to promote/encourage future developers to build such structures.
- Zoning: is the proposed plan for subdividing the property within codes?
- Assessor record discrepancy: Recent information has listed the property at 24,000 SF, whereas a 2003 assessment listed 14,000 SF. Why the discrepancy?
- This property had, at one time, been deemed undevelopable due to steep slope and soil stability issues. What has changed to now make it developable?

I would ask that the Planning Commission strongly consider not approving the current proposed development plan and suggest to the builder/developer that a more neighborhood friendly, ecological and geological plan be considered.

Thank you for your time and consideration when deciding on the proposed use of this property. Your commitment to the city of Colorado Springs is much appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

Dee Dengler
416 Cooper Avenue, Colorado Springs, CO 80905
deedengler@msn.com

Turisk, Michael

From: cheryl adams <cherikadams@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 15, 2016 12:57 PM
To: Turisk, Michael
Subject: comments regarding Robbin Place proposed development

Mr Turisk and Planning Commission,

Thank you for giving us this opportunity to comment on the proposed Robbin Place development.

Our names are Cheryl and Marc Raab, and we live at 419 Cooper Ave. We have been in the neighborhood since 2006, and have no plans to leave any time in the next twenty years or so.

We have a few concerns about the proposed development which we would like to air here:

- There is a family of sharp-shinned hawks that has made the neighborhood its home, and the hillside is prime hunting ground for them. I would be concerned that the proposed development would impact their habitat.
- The hillside in question is steep, and prone to erosion without the native vegetation mitigating the possibility of landslides. Building duplexes on this site would require some serious "support infrastructure" that we have serious doubts about.
- The lot size as indicated in the proposal would inevitably increase automotive traffic up and down the Manitou Ave/Boulder hill. This road is already in an advanced state of disrepair, and I worry about further damage to the roads here.
- That increase in traffic would most likely increase the danger to the many children who live in the neighborhood.
- Most of the homes on our block, as well as the rest of the neighborhood, were constructed from 1890's - 1910's. While we don't have any opposition to duplexes per se, most of the current duplexes we've seen don't have the style that would fit in with the character of the neighborhood as it currently stands. If the development were to be approved, we would request that the integrity of the neighborhood be maintained regarding the design of the units.

In closing, we are not opposed to development in the neighborhood. There are some new dwellings going up on the Uintah/17th Street side of Manitou Ave that, we have to say, add something interesting to the neighborhood. There is also the apartment complex and the duplexes on Monument that I did not much care for, but which were built in a previously undeveloped area. In addition, the development behind the Boys and Girls Club/Living Hope Church area have added to the neighborhood rather than detracting from it. In this case, however, the concerns we have laid out above preclude our being able to support this particular development.

Thank you for volunteering your time to address these and other planning issues. We sincerely appreciate the work you do for the City.

Regards,
Cheryl and Marc Raab
419 Cooper Ave 80905
(719) 321-8184 • (719) 321-8490

Adam Poe
406 Cooper Ave.
Colorado Springs, CO 80905

I have concerns for the Robbin Place development:

1. Safety
 - a. No fire-truck access on the alley (too narrow)
 - b. No fire hydrant nearby
 - c. In case of emergency, how will emergency vehicle access the area?
2. Traffic
 - a. Increased traffic down a narrow alley
 - b. Alley is used now for driveway/ garage entrance
 - c. Cars backing out into alley and on-coming traffic could create a nuisance
 - d. Speed, flow, congestion increased
3. Land slippage
 - a. Concern with land slippage on the grassy hill once develop on it
 - b. Flooding, storm water, drainage into our backyards and down our main streets
4. Fit with neighborhood
 - a. This development plan does not fit with the character of the existing neighborhood
 - b. Small, quaint houses, single-family
 - c. 1 duplex would be ok or even 1 new single family home, but stuffing 3 into a small space doesn't make sense

Sara Poe
406 Cooper Ave.
Colorado Springs, CO 80905

1. The design of 3 duplexes sitting high near a grassy hill on an alley does not fit with the surrounding neighborhood. It is not harmonious with the other single-family small old homes. Most of the homes were built in the early 1900's with either no garage or driveway, or with an entrance off the alley. This is a quiet street with young families and old.
2. The development is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood due to the fact that it will over burden an alley that is primarily used to access driveways. The increased traffic flow through a small alley is worrisome with concerns for traffic flow, friction and speed.
3. I am concerned about the fire hazards considering a fire truck cannot access the property due to the alley being too small. There is no nearby fire hydrant.
4. I am concerned with land slippage with building on a hillside. This concerns the residents sitting against the alley with future problems of flooding and damage.

Overall, the residents are concerned that if a development like this is started, then the precedent will be started for other like- projects to begin in the neighborhood. As the area residents are not opposed to development, we are concerned more with the fit and look of the development to fit what is currently here. Some families have lived on this block for over 60 years. The quaint homes and shaded lawns and vegetation in the backyards is what makes the Westside unique.

Thank you for your time,

Sara

August 29th, 2016

Robbin Place Development
File No. CPC PFP 16-00054, CPC SWP 16-00057

To whom it may concern,

The neighbors on Cooper Ave. are formally appealing the decision made at the City Planning Commission meeting on Aug. 18th regarding a subdivision waiver for public alleyway access. We wish to appeal before City Council to address this issue and the public process.

We were given the appeal application form of administrative decision from the City Planner on this case, Michael Turisk.

We have chosen to appeal on the grounds that the planning commission is incorrect because it was "unreasonable."

Please see attached letter which accompanies the application.

Thank you,

Sara Poe
Cooper Ave. neighborhood representative

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
2016 AUG 29 P 4: 24

Appeal Letter

File No. CPC PFP 16-00054, CPC SWP 16-00057

In accordance with City Code Section 7.5.906, the neighbors on Cooper Ave. believe the decision made at the City Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, Aug. 18th regarding the subdivision waiver for public alleyway access is incorrect and unreasonable. We believe it did not address the most important concerns. We understand that the City Planning Commission was only to address the subdivision waiver request but feel that the public interest was not given due process.

We know prospective builders of most vacant residential sites only need to apply for building permits to build homes, without public notification. However, in this case where building is affecting surrounding properties due to land slippage, we feel public input is warranted.

The most important issues are as follows:

1. Land Slippage.

Land slippage is already occurring on the Westside, in areas of existing structures and new construction sites. The geological survey notes that this slope as it currently stands is "marginally stable." It also states that this area is "susceptible for future landslide activity."

The landslide susceptibility area covers much of the area North and South of 543 Robin Place.

2. Alleyway Access.

As voted upon on Aug. 18th, 5-1, the alleyway access will become a public road. Currently it is used by a few household as their main entrance to their driveway and garage with back-out driveways. It is also used for garbage trucks and pedestrians.

Chapter 7, Article 3, Part 1 of City Code states that the purposes of Residential Districts is to "Provide neighborhoods for residential living with a broad range of dwelling unit densities and development types consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and its standards for public health, safety, welfare and aesthetics."

Neighbors in this area are concerned for their safety with an added 4 cars per duplex backing out and driving down a proposed one-way alley.

The granting of the subdivision waiver was done contrary to the intent of the city's Subdivision Policy Manual and the Public Works Design Manual regarding requirements needed unless a variance has been approved by City Engineer.

3. Zoning.

The property is zoned R-2 which is consistent with the neighborhood. However, subdividing each lot would create 6 R-2 lots whose minimum lot size is less than the code requirement for R-2.

Chapter 7, Article 3, Part 1, 7.3.103 states that multi family dwellings on individual lots are not permitted.

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE
2016 AUG 29 P 4:24

Overall, the neighbors on Cooper Ave. are concerned for safety associated with increased traffic on a one-way street, future landslide activity, proper zoning requirements, and due process. We feel the developer has skirted the big issues by only asking for the subdivision waiver to access his property.

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE

2016 AUG 29 P 4: 24

Dear Mr. Turisk,

Our names are Ann and Ronald Valdez. We have resided at 432 N. Cooper Ave. 80905 for 25 years.

These are our concerns in regards to the proposed Robin Place development:

- Land slippage

- 1) Development of this area is dangerous due to unstable soil on a steep slope. Future landslides could occur, according to the Colorado geological survey conducted. Damage to these and surrounding properties could occur. If damage occurs, development on poor soil, improper planning, the developer must be held responsible for repairs and/or property replacement - not city tax do. This should be done in a fair manner.

- Potential drainage & sloping problems.

- 1) Consideration to surrounding properties to prevent damage, should occur when planning

Dear Mr. Turisk,

Our names are Ann and Ronald Valdez. We have resided at 432 N. Cooper Ave 80905 for 25 years.

These are our concerns in regards to the proposed Robin Place development:

- Land slippage

- 1) Development of this area is dangerous due to unstable soil on a steep slope. Future landslides could occur, according to the Colorado geological survey conducted. Damage to these and surrounding properties could occur. If damage occurs, development on poor soil, improper planning, the developer must be held responsible for repairs and/or property replacement - not city tax dollars. This should be done in a tax manner.

- Potential drainage & sloping problems.

- 1) Consideration to surrounding properties to prevent damage, should occur when planning

Figure 3 - emails

development blend and keep
in character with the existing
homes on the Westside.

Thank you for considering
our concerns in your decisions.

Ann Valdez
Ronald Valdez