



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Complete this form if you are appealing an **Administrative Decision** to City Planning Commission.

Appellant Contact Information

Jennifer T. Kuhn, Esq. c/o Michael D. Kuhn, Esq. 719-651-5827

Name of Appellant

Phone Number

12640 Woodruff Drive, Colorado Springs, CO 80921

Address (Include City, State, ZIP)

mkuhn@klcs.law; jennifertkuhn@gmail.com

Email

Project Information

DEPN-25-0056 (Colorado Springs Temple)

Project Name

2396 Veneto Way

Site Address (TSN if not yet addressed)

Development Plans

Type of Application Being Appealed

DEPN-25-0056 (Pre-Application Records located at PRE-25-0058)

All File Numbers Associated with the Application

Tamara Baxter

N/A

N/A

Project Planner's Name

Hearing Date

Item Number on Agenda

Appellant Authorization

The signature(s) below certifies that I (we) is(are) the authorized appellant and that the information provided on this form is in all respects true and accurate to the best of my (our) knowledge and belief. I(we) familiarized myself(ourselves) with the rules, regulations and procedures with respect to preparing and filing this petition. I agree that if this request is approved, it is issued on the representations made in this submittal, and any approval or subsequently issued building permit(s) or other type of permit(s) may be revoked without notice if there is a breach of representations or conditions of approval.

Jennifer T. Kuhn 11/10/25

Signature of Appellant

Date



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Appeal Submittal Should Include:

All Items Are Required

- ☒ Completed Appeal Form (this document).
- ☒ Evidence of "Affected Party" Status – check the box below and provide justification for the chosen box.
- ☒ Notice of Appeal (see requirements on page 3 of this document).
- ☒ \$176 check payable to the City of Colorado Springs.

Submit all 4 items above to into the Accela review system - <https://aca-prod.accela.com/COSPRINGS/Default.aspx>.

Appeals are accepted for 10 days after a decision has been made. Submittals must be received no later than 5pm MST on the due date of the appeal. Incomplete submittals and / or submittals received after 5pm or outside of the 10-day window will not be accepted. If the due date for the submittal falls on a weekend or federal holiday, the deadline is extended to the following business day at 5 pm MST.

If you need additional assistance with this application, please call the Land Use Review front desk at (719) 385-5905.

Affected Party Status

Please indicate, per UDC Subsection 7.5.415.A(1)(a) (Right to Appeal), which of the definitions of "Affected Party" that applies to the Appellant.

- ☐ (1) The applicant for the decision being appealed;
- ☐ (2) The owner or tenant of a lot or parcel of land located within one thousand (1,000) feet of the subject lot; or
- ☐ (3) Any owner or tenant of a lot or parcel of land located within three (3) miles of the subject property who has preserved standing by:
 - ☐ (a) Testifying at the public hearing on the application;
 - ☒ (b) Submitting written comments prior to the public hearing on the application; or
 - ☒ (c) In the case of applications approved by the Manager or an administrative official, submitting written comments to the Manager or administrative official during the comment period before the Manager or administrative official's action.



PLANNING + NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICES

Land Use Review

Appeal of an Administrative Decision to City Planning Commission

Notice of Appeal

The Notice of Appeal Shall State:

- (1) The specific provision(s) of this UDC that is the basis of the appeal;
- (2) Which of the following criteria for reversal or modification of the decision is applicable to the appeal:
 - (a) The decision is contrary to the express language of this UDC;
 - (b) The decision is erroneous; or
 - (c) The decision is clearly contrary to law; and
- (3) Describe how the criteria for the relevant application have or have not been met.

COLORADO SPRINGS PLANNING COMMISSION

Appellant: Jennifer T. Kuhn
12640 Woodruff Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80921

Project: Colorado Springs Temple
Project No.: DEPN-25-0056
Address: 2396 Veneto Way
Colorado Springs, CO 80921

Administrative Approval Date: November 6, 2025

NOTICE OF APPEAL OF ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

Appellant Jennifer T. Kuhn (“Appellant”), by and through counsel, KLCS PC, submits her Notice of Appeal of Administrative Decision as follows:

I. DECISION BEING APPEALED AND BASIS FOR APPEAL

This appeal challenges the administrative approval of Project No. DEPN-25-0056, commonly known as the Colorado Springs Temple, which authorizes a 140½-foot illuminated spire—roughly the height of a commercial wind turbine—on an 18.6-acre parcel located at 2396 Veneto Way, Colorado Springs, CO 80921. The property is owned by the Corporation of the Presiding Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (“Applicant”).

Appellant Jennifer T. Kuhn owns 12640 Woodruff Drive, located within three miles of the site. By letters dated October 14 and October 25, 2025, she submitted written objections emphasizing that the Unified Development Code (“UDC”) expressly requires architectural features exceeding height limits in residential zones to be “designed or screened to minimize visibility.” The Applicant’s proposal does the opposite—its spire is deliberately designed to be visually dominant, continuously illuminated, and unshielded.

Despite these objections, on November 6, 2025, City Planning Supervisor Tamara Baxter approved the project without imposing any visibility-mitigation conditions. That approval authorizes a structure more than three times the maximum height permitted in this residential context, yet contains no findings, analysis, or enforceable conditions showing compliance with UDC § 7.4.203(B)(2).

The City's development standards are clear: any structure exceeding the district height limit must be either screened or designed to minimize visibility from surrounding residential properties. The Applicant did neither, and the City treated this mandatory requirement as optional. That is a plain legal error.

This appeal does not challenge the religious use of the property or the construction of a temple. It challenges only the City's failure to enforce neutral, generally applicable development standards that protect residential character and visual harmony.

The approval must be reversed and remanded because it disregards the plain language of the UDC, offers no analysis explaining how a 140½-foot spire is reasonable, and imposes no enforceable measures to mitigate its visibility. Accordingly, the decision is (a) contrary to the express language of the UDC; (b) erroneous; and/or (c) clearly contrary to law. The approval effectively nullifies the UDC's visibility safeguards, undermines the integrity the City's zoning framework, and cannot stand.

II. GOVERNING LAW: THE CODE REQUIRES VISIBILITY MINIMIZATION

UDC Table 7.4.2-F permits certain architectural features, including spires, to exceed standard height limits under specific conditions. But Table 7.4.2-F does not operate in isolation. UDC § 7.4.203(B)(2) provides that architectural features permitted to extend beyond the maximum building height shall be designed or screened to minimize visibility from nearby residential districts. This requirement is mandatory. Because the Applicant proposed no screening, the Applicant must show that its design minimizes visibility. The approval contains no analysis, no visibility study, no material specifications, and no enforceable conditions reflecting such minimization.

III. THE APPROVED DESIGN IS UNREASONABLY HIGH AND MAXIMIZES VISIBILITY

The design of the spire accentuates visibility. Its extraordinary height is not softened by massing, parapet integration, or screening. Although the Applicant suggested the use of matte materials, no enforceable conditions were included in the approval. There are no binding finish specifications, no LRV data, no final color selection, and no lighting restrictions. Without enforceable conditions, the spire may be reflective, illuminated, and visually dominant both day and night. A structure designed to be seen from great distance cannot be said to minimize visibility.

IV. RESPONSE TO APPLICANT'S RLUIPA ARGUMENTS

Applicant argued below that it is entitled to construct a 140½-foot spire irrespective of the UDC's express requirements, invoking the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act ("RLUIPA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000cc *et seq.* Applicant is wrong, as detailed in Appellant's written comments. Nothing in RLUIPA prevents the City from applying neutral, generally applicable zoning provisions that serve legitimate governmental purposes such as preserving neighborhood character, ensuring visual harmony, and maintaining aesthetic consistency. A requirement that a structure exceeding height limits be designed to minimize visibility is the very type of neutral aesthetic and land-use regulation that courts have consistently upheld as permissible and not a "substantial burden" on religious exercise.

Even in the case cited by Applicant involved a substantial reduction in the proposed spire height to achieve compatibility with surrounding development—precisely the type of compromise the City failed to require here.

V. RELIEF REQUESTED AND RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

Appellant respectfully requests that the Planning Commission:

- Reverse the project approval; or
- Remand with directives requiring compliance with UDC § 7.4.203(B)(2), including enforceable conditions governing finish and material reflectivity, color specifications, lighting limits, and height or mass modification necessary to minimize visibility.

Appellant reserves the right to appeal to City Council and seek judicial review under C.R.C.P. 106(a)(4). Appellant has attached certain relevant documents including Appellant's letter the approval letter.

Dated: November 10, 2025.

KLCS PC

/s/ Michael D. Kuhn

Michael D. Kuhn, #42784

431 North Cascade Avenue, Suite 1

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Telephone: (719) 651-5827

Email: mkuhn@klcs.law

Counsel for Appellant



431 N. CASCADE AVENUE, STE. 1
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80903
TELEPHONE: (719) 215-8000
FAX: (719) 457-5366

Michael D. Kuhn
Email: mkuhn@klcs.law

October 14, 2025

Via email – tamara.baxter@coloradosprings.gov

Tamara Baxter
Planning Supervisor – North Planning Area Team
Planning Department
City of Colorado Springs

Re: Public Comment re: Colorado Springs Temple
2396 Veneto Way, Colorado Springs, CO 80921
DEPN-25-0056

Dear Ms. Baxter:

This firm represents Jennifer T. Kuhn, owner of the real property located at 12640 Woodruff Drive, Colorado Springs, CO 80921, situated within three miles of the proposed development of a Colorado Springs Temple at 2396 Veneto Way, Colorado Springs, CO 80921 (the “Project”). Please accept this correspondence as Mrs. Kuhn’s formal comments regarding the Project and its compliance with the Colorado Springs Municipal Code and the Unified Building Code (“UBC”)

1. Applicant’s Proposed 140½-Foot-Tall Spire Fails to Address the Screening Requirements Set Forth in Colorado Springs Unified Building Code § 7.4.203(B)(2)

The Applicant proposes a temple featuring a spire reaching 140½ feet in height—roughly the size of a large wind turbine. This proposed spire exceeds the 40-foot maximum building height permitted for mixed-use neighborhood zoning under the UBC.

UBC § 7.4.203(B) governs exceptions to the height limitations, stating:

[N]o building or structure or part of a building or structure shall exceed the maximum building height within any zone district as shown in Tables 7.4.2-A through D, unless authorized in Table 7.4.2-F[.]

Tamara Baxter
October 14, 2025
Page 2 of 3

Relevant here, Table 7.4.2-F allows for religious “spires and towers” provided they do not exceed 5 percent of the footprint of the primary structure from which they arise.

However, UBC § 7.4.203(B)(2) further mandates that “building features that extend beyond the maximum building height pursuant to Table 7.4.2-F **shall be designed or screened to minimize visibility** from the R-E, R-1 9, R-1 6, R-2, and R-Flex Low zone districts, and from any portion of a PDZ district developed or designated for attached or detached single-family or two-family dwelling structures.” (Emphasis added).

While the Applicant cites the Table 7.4.2-F exception, **it fails entirely to address the design and screening requirements of UBC § 7.4.203(B)(2)**. See Westwood Project Statement, p. 8. Indeed, the Applicant’s plans do the opposite, proposing illumination of the spire—even at night—and renderings depict the spire painted in a reflective metallic gold color. Both illumination and highly reflective finishes directly contradict the code’s mandate to minimize visibility.

Mrs. Kuhn objects to the proposed spire because it does not comply with UBC § 7.4.203(B)(2). At a minimum, the Applicant should be required to:

- Prohibit illumination of the spire, except for lighting mandated by governmental authorities such as the FAA. Any permitted lighting should be soft, downward-directed, and minimally intrusive.
- Utilize materials and colors that blend with the sky or surrounding environment, employing earth tones with non-reflective or matte finishes to avoid glare.
- Screen the lower portions of the spire using roof parapets and mature landscaping, ensuring that the structure does not dominate the skyline of nearby residential districts.
- Significantly reduce the proposed height of the spire.

Failing to meet these screening and visibility requirements is contrary to the express language of the UBC, legally erroneous, and inconsistent with municipal code intent. Mrs. Kuhn submits these comments and expressly reserves her right to appeal any approval of the proposed spire to the Colorado Springs Planning Commission, the City Council, and to the District Court via Colo. R. Civ. P. 106.

2. Applicant's Proposal Does Not Adequately Address Traffic Concerns

The Project proposes a large religious facility in the midst of a residential neighborhood, which will generate substantial traffic concentrated at predictable times, particularly Sundays and other major religious observances.

Key concerns include:

Single Access Point: The Applicant currently proposes only one access point on Veneto Way, which is a local residential street. This creates a bottleneck for ingress and egress, risks traffic congestion, and could compromise public safety during peak periods.

Impact on Residential Streets: A temple of this size will inevitably lead to overflow traffic into adjacent residential streets, including Woodruff Drive and surrounding neighborhoods. Residents will face increased vehicle volumes, higher speeds, and potential safety hazards for pedestrians, including children and the elderly.

Emergency Access: Concentrated traffic and limited access points may impede emergency vehicles, creating a safety hazard in the event of a medical emergency, fire, or other urgent situations.

Parking and Queuing: Large congregations may exceed the proposed on-site parking capacity, leading to vehicles queuing onto residential streets, blocking driveways, and creating hazards for school buses, cyclists, and neighborhood traffic.

Traffic Study Deficiencies: The Applicant's traffic analysis does not adequately address peak-hour impacts, sightline safety, and mitigation measures, such as turn lanes, signalization, or staggered entry/exit plans. A robust traffic study, including independent review and community input, is essential before approval.

Given these concerns, the Project's current traffic plan is inadequate and incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood. At a minimum, the Applicant should be required to:

- Provide secondary or alternative access points to disperse traffic and reduce congestion.
- Submit a comprehensive traffic impact study addressing peak hours, residential street impacts, emergency access, and pedestrian safety.

Tamara Baxter
October 14, 2025
Page 2 of 3

- Incorporate traffic mitigation measures, including turn lanes, signalization, staggered ingress/egress times, and signage to ensure neighborhood safety.
- Implement community-informed traffic management strategies to minimize the Project's impact on residential streets.

Mrs. Kuhn reserves the right to object to any approval that fails to meaningfully address these traffic concerns. occur during certain times, particularly on Sundays. Applicant currently only has one proposed access point on Veneto Way.

Either you or the applicant may reach me directly at (719) 651-5827.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Michael D. Kuhn", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael Kuhn

MDK/kb



431 N. CASCADE AVENUE, STE. 1
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80903
TELEPHONE: (719) 215-8000
FAX: (719) 457-5366

Michael D. Kuhn
Email: mkuhn@klcs.law

October 25, 2025

Via email only

Trevor D. Gloss, Esq. – trevor.gloss@coloradosprings.gov
Colorado Springs Deputy City Attorney
30 S. Nevada Avenue, Suite 501
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Tamara Baxter – tamara.baxter@coloradosprings.gov
Senior Planner, City of Colorado Springs
30 S. Nevada Avenue, Suite 501
Colorado Springs, CO 80903

Re: Public Comment re: Colorado Springs Temple
2396 Veneto Way, Colorado Springs, CO 80921
DEPN-25-0056

Dear Mr. Gloss and Ms. Baxter:

My client and I have reviewed the Applicant's response to our comment submitted on October 14, 2025, regarding the proposed 140 ½ foot-tall temple spire. This letter addresses a few points raised in the Applicant's response.

I. Applicant's Religious Purpose Does Not Exempt It from Complying with the UDC.

Applicant relies on *Martin v. The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints*, 747 N.E.2d 131, 137 (Mass. 2001), for the proposition that it is not the government's role to determine "whether the inclusion of a visible and highlighted steeple is integral to a temple's religious purposes." 10/22/25 Ltr., at 1.

Martin, however, is readily distinguishable and, in fact, undermines Applicant's position. The *Martin* court merely held that government officials may not second-guess whether an architectural feature has a religious as opposed to an aesthetic function. Mrs. Kuhn does not dispute that Applicant's proposed spire serves

October 25, 2025

Page 2 of 6

a religious purpose. The issue is far narrower: whether a religious applicant must nevertheless comply with the neutral, generally applicable requirements of the Uniform Building Code.

Courts uniformly hold that houses of worship are subject to municipal building and zoning regulations that are reasonably related to legitimate governmental interests in promoting public health, safety, and general welfare. *See Bd. of Zoning Appeals v. Decatur, Ind. Co. of Jehovah's Witnesses*, 117 N.E.2d 115, 118 (Ind. 1954); *City of Solon v. Solon Baptist Temple, Inc.*, 457 N.E.2d 858 (Ohio Ct. App. 1982); *City of Sherman v. Simms*, 183 S.W.2d 415 (Tex. 1944); *Wojtanowski v. Franciscan Fathers Minor Conventuals*, 148 N.W.2d 54 (Wis. 1967); *Hintz v. Zion Evangelical United Brethren Church*, 109 N.W.2d 61 (Wis. 1961). These decisions recognize that neutral building and safety standards may be applied to religious structures without offending constitutional protections.

Indeed, *Martin* itself reaffirmed that religious buildings remain subject to municipal regulation when the rules advance legitimate governmental purposes—such as preserving neighborhood character, protecting sightlines and access to light, and maintaining aesthetic harmony. *See also City of Ladue v. Gilleo*, 512 U.S. 43, 49 (1994) (recognizing the municipal interest in visual harmony and consistency); *Berman v. Parker*, 348 U.S. 26, 33 (1954) (aesthetics and general welfare are valid bases for land-use regulation).

Martin is notable for another reason. The court expressly observed that the local board was entitled to consider whether a reduced steeple height would reasonably accommodate both the church's needs and the town's legitimate interests. 747 N.E.2d at 140. The church voluntarily amended its design, *lowering the steeple from 156 feet to 83 feet*. *Id.* at n.22. Applicant has made no comparable effort here.

Accordingly, *Martin* provides no shelter for Applicant's refusal to comply with applicable height regulations. Rather, it confirms the principle that municipalities may enforce neutral, generally applicable building codes against religious structures when those regulations further legitimate and well-established public purposes.

II. Existing Zoning Changes Nothing.

Applicant contends that because no zoning changes have been proposed for the surrounding area, nearby residents have long been on notice that the property would be used for religious purposes. This argument collapses under its own weight. The surrounding parcels were, and remain, zoned for residential use. That undisputed fact is precisely why the screening and design requirements in UDC § 7.4.203(B)(2) apply in full. Applicant cannot simultaneously rely on the area's residential zoning to

October 25, 2025

Page 2 of 6

claim “notice” while ignoring the residential protections that accompany that same zoning classification.

Moreover, even accepting Applicant’s notice argument at face value, it is legally irrelevant. Awareness that a parcel might be used for religious purposes does not exempt construction from compliance with neutral, generally applicable building regulations. Religious use is not a license to disregard the UDC.

Applicant’s argument also fails on its facts. The record shows Applicant did not acquire the property until 2012. See *El Paso County Property Records*, Parcel No. 6209303001 (<https://property.spatalest.com/co/elpaso/#/property/6209303001>). Many of the surrounding homes—including Mrs. Kuhn’s residence, constructed in 2009—predate Applicant’s acquisition. Those homeowners could not have had any notice, constructive or otherwise, that a large-scale religious facility would later be built near their properties.

In short, Applicant’s notice theory not only misstates the facts but also misconstrues the law. The applicable zoning and building requirements exist to protect residential character and the rights of neighboring homeowners—protections that Applicant must honor, not evade.

III. Applicant’s Interpretation of “Screening” Fails.

Applicant concedes that UDC § 7.4.203(B)(2) imposes mandatory screening for any structure exceeding the maximum height in residential neighborhoods. Yet, in a blatant effort to evade compliance, Applicant attempts to rewrite the Code, asserting—without a shred of textual support—that these screening requirements apply only to mechanical equipment like HVAC units. This interpretation is meritless. The Code explicitly addresses both mechanical features and architectural elements, including church spires, in Table 7.4.2-F. Nowhere does § 7.4.203(B)(2) limit its reach to mechanical structures alone. The purpose of these provisions is plain: to preserve visual harmony, protect neighborhood aesthetics, and maintain the character of residential areas. Applicant cannot manufacture exceptions where none exist.

Applicant compounds this error by seizing on the phrase “designed or screened” and claiming that the proposed spire complies based solely on its design. This argument is entirely hollow—but at a minimum, the City should mandate design requirements that minimize visibility. Such design requirements should limit the size of the spire (as in *Martin*), prohibit illumination, and mandate matte, neutral paint.

October 25, 2025

Page 2 of 6

Each of Applicant's so-called "design features" fails on its own terms—even it were not subject to the "screening" requirement:

- "Golden Ratio". Applicant asserts that the spire adheres to the "Golden Ratio," as if invoking architectural mythology excuses noncompliance. There is no evidence—none—demonstrating that a 140½-foot spire actually complies. This is pure *ipse dixit*, unsubstantiated opinion masquerading as fact. Compliance with the Code cannot be outsourced to self-serving claims about aesthetics.
- Lighting. Applicant further claims it will illuminate the spire with a "narrow beam" of light. This is patently contrary to the Code. Lighting increases visibility; it does not mitigate it. Any illumination beyond government-mandated safety requirements exacerbates the very visual impact the screening requirements are designed to prevent.
- Reflectivity and Materials. Applicant promises materials "carefully chosen to avoid excessive reflectivity." Yet the only evidence submitted depicts a gold, highly reflective spire. No colors, no finishes, no specifications—just Applicant's unverified assurance. The City cannot—and must not—accept such empty representations. Any approval must be conditioned on enforceable specifications for color, finish, and materials that actually minimize visual impact, consistent with UDC § 7.4.203(B)(2).

In short, Applicant's interpretation of the Code is wrong. It attempts to nullify the plain language, structure, and purpose of the Code, while offering nothing more than speculative design assertions in its stead. The screening and design requirements apply squarely to the proposed spire, and any suggestion otherwise is meritless.

IV. Legal and Planning Precedent Do Not Support the Proposed Spire.

Applicant contends that "[n]umerous religious structures in Colorado Springs and other municipalities feature illuminated spires or towers without physical screening." 10/22/25 Ltr., at 3. This argument is entirely unsubstantiated: Applicant fails to identify a single example in its submission, leaving Mrs. Kuhn with nothing to respond to but unsupported assertion. Claims without citation or evidence cannot carry the day.

Even the examples that Mrs. Kuhn can identify are wholly inapposite for three independent reasons:

October 25, 2025

Page 2 of 6

Antiquity. Many cited structures were built in the late 19th or early 20th centuries, long before the adoption of the UDC. Historical precedent does not override current, generally applicable building regulations.

Context. These spires are not located in residential neighborhoods, but in downtown or commercial districts, where visual impact and neighborhood character are governed by entirely different considerations.

Size and Scale. Existing spires are significantly shorter than the one proposed by Applicant.

Illustrative examples include:

- Grace and St. Stephen's Episcopal Church (1872). This iconic downtown bell tower rises to only 90 feet—50 feet shorter than Applicant's proposed spire—and is situated outside any residential zone.
<https://www.historycolorado.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/2018/5ep350.pdf> at p.3
- Will Rogers Shrine of the Sun (1937). The shrine's spire reaches 100 feet. It is located outside residential areas and predates the UDC by decades.
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Will_Rogers_Shrine_of_the_Sun
- St. Mary's Cathedral (1891). The cathedral features an east steeple of 73 feet, far below the height of Applicant's proposed structure.
<https://www.stmaryscathedral.org/about>
- Shove Memorial Chapel (1914) . The chapel features a 30 foot tall spire and is near residential areas. The spire is 90 feet shorter than Applicant's proposed spire. <https://www.coloradocollege.edu/offices/chaplainsoffice/spaces/shove-memorial-chapel.html>

None of these examples supports Applicant's claim that its proposed 140½-foot illuminated spire can escape the UDC's screening and design requirements. They differ in age, context, and scale, and therefore are legally and factually irrelevant. Applicant's reliance on unspecified "numerous" structures is nothing more than rhetoric; it cannot substitute for compliance with the Code.

It is telling that Applicant first raised the design and screening requirements in the UDC only in response to Mrs. Kuhn's objection and comment. Nothing it has said alters the conclusion that the proposed spire violates the UDC. Rather than minimizing its visibility in a residential area, Applicant's design emphasizes the spire

October 25, 2025

Page 2 of 6

through its size, color, and illumination. The City should require modifications to the spire as set forth above, including a reduction in size.

Mrs. Kuhn also reaffirms her objections to the traffic concerns previously raised.

Mrs. Kuhn remains willing to engage with Applicant to discuss modifications that could address her concerns. Absent such changes, she will appeal of any approval through the Planning Commission, City Council, and the District Court.

Sincerely,



Michael D. Kuhn

MDK/

cc: Client
Carolynne C. White, Esq. (cwhite@bhfs.com)



**PLANNING DEPARTMENT
Land Use Review Division**

November 6, 2025

Katie Gray
Westwood
10333 E Dry Creek Rd, Suite 400
Englewood, CO 80112

RE: Approval Letter for Colorado Springs Temple Development Plan
File Number: DEPN-25-0056

Dear Ms. Gray

The City's Land Use Review Division administratively approved the above-mentioned development plan for the Colorado Springs Temple to allow for the development of a temple, meeting house, maintenance building, pavilion and ancillary site improvements on November 6, 2025. The plat for this project is Flying Horse No. 24 Filing No. 1. This approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Development must conform completely to the approved development plan.
2. All site grading must substantially comply with the grading illustrated on the preliminary grading plan.
3. The buildings architecture must substantially comply with the elevation drawings.
4. Utility main and service locations on this plan are illustrative only, and are not approved with this development plan.
5. Parkland Dedication Ordinance, School Ordinance, and Citywide Development Impact Fees below:
 - No fee for park dedication is required; as land dedication has been requested
 - No fee for school dedication is required; as land dedication has been requested.
 - This project requires Citywide Development Impact (Police & Fire) fees in the amount of \$32,829.48 total per City Code 7.5.532.

The listed fees are due to be paid prior to building permit approval. These fees can be paid in person, via check, or credit card at 2880 International Circle, Suite 200-7, or by calling (719) 385-5982. **These fees are determined as of the date of this approval and are subject to increase.**
6. A Preliminary Landscape Plan and/or a Preliminary Irrigation Plan is approved in this application. A **Final Landscape and Irrigation Plan are due at time of building permit** per Code language.
7. Financial Assurances for public and private improvements are **due at time of building permit issuance**, per City Code and policy. Please contact the City's Engineering Development Review Division of Public Works Department at (719) 385-5918 for assurance information pertaining to public or stormwater improvements. For private improvement assurances, please contact the City's Development Review Enterprise at (719) 385-5982 or DREplanninginfo@coloradosprings.gov.
8. A sign permit through Development Review Enterprise is required for all signage, prior to installation.

Please attach one copy of the approved development plan set to each set of construction drawings submitted to the Regional Building Department in conjunction with the building permit application. A Certificate of Occupancy will not be issued for the development until all private and public improvements shown on the plan are completed or financially secured.

This development plan approval will expire **six (6) years** from the approval date unless a building permit is issued for the construction of the project. If any changes to the approved site or building design become necessary prior to, or during construction, an amended development plan will need to be submitted for City Planning review and approval.

If you have any questions regarding the above sections, please contact me at 719-385-5621 or tamara.baxter@coloradosprings.gov.

Sincerely,



Tamara Baxter
Planning Supervisor

C: City Planning File Nos. **DEPN-25-0056**
Development Review Enterprise – approval letter via email (Tamara.Baxter@coloradosprings.gov)
Engineering Development Review – approval letter via email (Development.Review@coloradosprings.gov)
Fire Prevention – approval letter via email (Steven.Smith@coloradosprings.gov)
CSU – approval letter via email (buckslips@csu.org)
Page Saulsbury – approval letter via email (Page.Saulsbury@coloradosprings.gov)
Caroline Miller – approval letter via email when PLDO &/or CDI applies (Caroline.Miller@coloradosprings.gov)

Visual Comparison Exhibit: Allowed Building Height vs. Proposed Spire Height

This exhibit illustrates the difference between the maximum building height permitted in the zoning district (40 feet) and the proposed spire height (approximately 140.5 feet), as referenced in the Notice of Appeal.

