

Hubble, Logan K

From: Teresa C. <tccrewsrn@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 19, 2023 2:27 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Re: Royal Pine Apartments - COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141

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 the update.

Please add to the list of concerns to be addressed:

Evacuation traffic not only due to a fire, but a toxic spill on either the railroad tracks to the west of Pine Creek and/or on Powers Blvd itself.

Thank you.

On Mon, Dec 18, 2023 at 4:13 PM Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello all –

Thank you for your continued interest in the Royal Pine Apartments applications. Staff has reviewed the applications and determined the proposed applications are ready to be referred to the City Planning Commission for public hearing. The project will be scheduled for the **January 10, 2023** City Planning Commission meeting. Meetings begin at 9 AM and are held at the Regional Development Center located at 2880 International Circle.

All required public notification will be mailed out and posted next week, however since I know today that this item will be scheduled I wanted to take the opportunity to provide as much advance notice as I could. When the complete agenda is posted, it will include information for how to virtually participate in the public hearing.

To look up the revised project information please use [this link](#)

The file numbers are COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141

If you have new comments that have not been previously sent to me about the subject applications, items specific to the revisions to the plans or items that were not previously shared with me, please email them to me. I assure you that any comments that you have already shared are recorded with this application and will be incorporated into the public record.

Please share this email with any neighborhood groups or residents that may not be aware of the projects. Reach out if you have any questions!

Thank you,

Logan Hubble

Planner II

30 S Nevada Ave. Suite 701

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

(719) 385-5099

Logan.Hubble@ColoradoSprings.gov



Hubble, Logan K

From: Paul DeCecco <pjdececco@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 17, 2023 8:51 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Re: DEPN-23-0141 and COPN-23-0015

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!

Logan,

thanks for continuing to send out the updates. Is there still time for consideration of neighborhood comments?

Can the city just take into account that the local residents don't want any apartments in that area whether low income or otherwise? that what we wanted was a small market that local residents could take advantage of. something that could be part of our community. Can't that be a primary consideration since we already live here?

As I am sure you do, I love living here in Colorado Springs, but I am concerned as a resident how we are developing our city and this development is another example of a missed opportunities. We continue to develop in a way that requires residents to have to have a car to do just about anything - groceries, work, retail. There are other ways to develop that can help reduce traffic and help create a sense of local community. Walkable communities could include mixed use of homes, retail, dining, and shopping.

I think many of the residents (myself included) were looking forward to having a small local retail area that we could walk to easily in the Pine Creek Market area. I am an Army Veteran (29 years) and lived in many places. When we lived in Northern VA, there was an area near where we live called Shirlington - it was a mixed use area very close to apartments and homes and was a walkable area. you can see it here (<https://www.stayarlington.com/neighborhoods/shirlington/>). We also lived overseas and loved being able to live in city areas where you can walk and build community relations. People love visiting these places yet we put up with suburb like cities here in our country/local area where you have to drive everywhere and you barely know your neighbors. we can do better.

It really does seem like the city is intent on putting the low-income housing in that area that was originally going to be "our" market area. There still is an opportunity to create 'community' in our area. why not really have it as mixed use with maybe half of the number of apartments. you could mix in some retail, a market, or something that residents can walk to as well as the residents of the new apartments could take advantage of it as well.

I know this won't change whether the city puts in low income housing or not in our little area, but I do hope that as you continue to plan the growth of our city, that the planners will consider development that allows for easily accessible (walking and biking) to close retail, dining, shopping so that we can not only reduce dependence on our cars but also get the ability to know better our neighbors.

There is a really great book that talks about this kind of development as well as ideas and strategies on how to build these kinds of communities even in our current developments. it is called "Happy City" by Charles Montgomery.

I hope you have a great holiday and thanks for what you do.

Paul DeCecco

On Fri, Dec 1, 2023 at 1:51 PM Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

City agencies have finished the fifth review of the Market at Pine Creek/Royal Pine Concept Plan and the fourth review of the Development Plan. I've uploaded comments to Accela from myself and the rest of the reviewers. There was only one comment that required a change to the development plan, and the developer has already resubmitted. The updated development plan has been distributed to city agencies for review, which will be complete by December 14th. You can view the new documents as well as the comments on the prior submittal at ColoradoSprings.gov/LDRS. (Make sure you click on the "PROJECTS SUBMITTED **AFTER** AUGUST 8, 2022" button, as the project is only viewable through this portal. On the next page, simply type "DEPN-23-0141" or "COPN-23-0015" into the Record Number field and click search. This should take you to the record page.) If you wish to comment on the proposed plans, please send them to me by December 13th.

As previously noted, this project will be referred to City Planning Commission without an administrative decision being made. However, this is not happening quite yet, as the Development Plan requires further changes to meet city standards. We anticipate that this review could be the final one for this project.

Thank you,

Logan Hubble

Planner II

30 S Nevada Ave. Suite 701

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

(719) 385-5099

Logan.Hubble@ColoradoSprings.gov



Hubble, Logan K

From: Bill <leahnbill89@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 11, 2023 5:04 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Re: DEPN-23-0141 and COPN-23-0015 - Royal Pines Apartments

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!

This town has become the city of apartments. Moved here 7 years ago and it is too bad.

On Wed, Nov 15, 2023 at 3:40 PM Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

City agencies have finished the fourth review of the Market at Pine Creek/Royal Pine Concept Plan and the third review of the Development Plan. I've just uploaded comments to Accela from myself and the rest of the reviewers. These can be viewed at [ColoradoSprings.gov/LDRS](https://coloradosprings.gov/LDRS). (Make sure you click on the "PROJECTS SUBMITTED **AFTER** AUGUST 8, 2022" button, as the project is only viewable through this portal. On the next page, simply type "DEPN-23-0141" or "COPN-23-0015" into the Record Number field and click search. This should take you to the record page.) I've also uploaded all of the citizen comments I have received thus far, to which the applicant will be required to respond. We are still accepting comments indefinitely, but any future comments will be uploaded following the next review.

As previously noted, this project will be referred to City Planning Commission without an administrative decision being made. However, this is not happening quite yet, as the Concept Plan and Development Plan require further changes to meet city standards.

Thank you,

Logan Hubble

Planner II

30 S Nevada Ave. Suite 701

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

(719) 385-5099

Logan.Hubble@ColoradoSprings.gov



Hubble, Logan K

From: Omar Wyman <omarwyman@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2023 10:06 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: PineCreek VillageNeighbors
Subject: Fwd: Objection to COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141 - Royal Pines Apartments

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!

Logan:

I am writing to express my deep frustration and disappointment regarding the handling of the development proposal I previously submitted concerns about on October 11, 2023. It is disheartening to note that, as of today, November 29, 2023, my concerns remain unaddressed. This lack of response not only disregards my efforts to engage constructively but also raises serious questions about the oversight process of this department.

It appears that developers are permitted to present claims without substantiating them, a practice that undermines the integrity of the entire process. Take, for instance, the recent developer response concerning the impact on property values, a critical aspect that the city planning department is entrusted to safeguard under the Urban Development Code (UDC). The developer's statement lacks any supporting evidence, yet it seems to have been accepted without question. Below is taken from the developer response:

Property values

There is no empirical evidence to suggest that this type of housing will negatively impact home values in Colorado Springs, as corroborated by analysis conducted by Community Development. DBG Properties has also studied home values in neighborhoods where it has developed, and there is no correlation to impact on home values. This data was split further to specific neighborhoods in higher income areas, and no correlation was found.

As a responsible citizen, it is disconcerting to witness a lack of due diligence in evaluating these claims by the very individuals supposedly hired to support the community (i.e., you). The absence of evidence-based assessment not only contradicts the principles of fair and transparent urban planning but also potentially jeopardizes the community's interests.

I urge you to revisit the proposal and ensure that all claims are thoroughly vetted and backed by credible evidence. It is imperative that the city planning department upholds its commitment to safeguarding community interests and enforcing the standards set forth in the UDC.

I look forward to a prompt and more rigorous review of the concerns raised. Your attention to this matter is not just expected; it is essential.

Sincerely,

Omar

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Omar Wyman** <omarwyman@gmail.com>

Date: Wed, Oct 11, 2023 at 10:07 PM

Subject: Objection to COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141 - Royal Pines Apartments

To: Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov>

Cc: PineCreek VillageNeighbors <pinecreekvillageneighbors@gmail.com>

Logan:

Below is my continued objection to the development of a 232-unit, multi-family apartment complex called "Royal Pines Apartments". **I want to preface this with that the developer and this City's Planning staff are inadequately answering answers to, not only myself, but other neighbors as well.** Hold yourself and these developers accountable with integrity. Additionally, City Staff has misled the neighborhood in public forums and will not hold themselves or their people accountable to their actions.

1) Lack of Developer Accountability on Property Impacts: This city planning staff is allowing the developer to provide "responses" to citizen comments without any factual basis and city staff is not holding the developer accountable to providing facts. **Where is the evidence to back up claims that their housing projects won't negatively affect Pine Creek?**

Some examples of impact to property values:

- In California, LIHTC-funded housing reduces home prices by almost 10%.
 - Link: <https://www.csus.edu/college/social-sciences-interdisciplinary-studies/public-policy-administration/internal/documents/thesis-bank/thesis-bank-2018-wahid.pdf>
- In South Africa, property values were negatively impacted for 9 years and it took an additional 6 years for them to recover from subsidized housing.
 - Link: <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/actas/article/view/208206>
- In Charlotte, NC, LIHTC-funded negatively impacted the property values for middle and high income neighborhoods. In high-income neighborhoods larger developments had even greater negative impact.
 - Link: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0042098015593448>

2) Lack of Proper Evacuation Study and Safety Concerns: This city is trapping its citizens to burn since it does not consider any proper evacuation modeling. City Planning staff allows the developer to submit an "evacuation" map with no basis and again, **DOES NOT HOLD THE DEVELOPER ACCOUNTABLE TO FACTS.** In addition to narrowing the roads in our neighborhood by introducing bike lanes we are making the same mistakes and Paradise and will lead to a lawsuit, just like it did in Paradise, CA (<https://www.latimes.com/local/california/la-me-ln-paradise-evacuation-road-20181120-story.html>).

You've allowed this developer to provide an evacuation map as part of their Traffic Study that DOESN'T HOW HOW PEOPLE WILL EVACUATE. The evacuation map points to additional egresses that are intersections for 10 neighborhood roads on Royal Pines Dr and 5 on Pine Manor. Are we expected to sit, wait, and burn in our houses while the city evacuates the apartments first? It's ridiculous to assume people are going to wait until they are told to leave in a proper evacuation. Every previous evacuation in Colorado Springs has shown that Zone Evacuation procedures DO NOT WORK. Remember Waldo Fire, the Black Forest Fire, and most recently, the Marshall Fire.

Hold yourself and the city accountable to smart development. Please, let us be proud of the people who are working for us to make our city a better place instead of having your citizens beg and plead for you guys to do your jobs.

Sincerely,

Omar Wyman

Hubble, Logan K

From: Ann Kumm <akummco1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2023 3:01 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Re: Royal Pines Apartments - COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141

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 Logan. I am running out of time and am just going to reiterate my major concerns, most of which have already been stated by others:

1. Traffic: It will become a pinchpoint, especially at the small roundabout. Pedestrians and cyclists have 9-10 lanes to cross at Royal Pine/Union, Union/Briargate Pkwy, and Royal Pine/Briargate Pkwy. Any apartment resident without a reliable vehicle will be subject to this, even to get to the metro bus stop. In the past few months I have seen no fewer than four accidents at the above intersections...all in broad daylight in clear, dry conditions. Too many drivers driving too fast and not paying attention. Additionally, as both a pedestrian/cyclist and as a witness while driving, I have had vehicles make turns into myself/others who are crossing during the allowed pedestrian lights at said intersections. It is a matter of time before there is a deadly or near-deadly vehicle/pedestrian/cyclist accident here.
2. Impact on the Pine Creek Neighborhood, a well-established (15-20 years) community:
 - Apartment parking lot lighting: drive into Pine Creek when it is dark and you can see that we are blessed to have a dark neighborhood at night. This was by design to keep the area closer to its natural environment. A cluster of lights on that one corner will totally change the feel of upper Pine Creek.
 - Parking: insufficient parking as planned by the developer will result in vehicles being parked in front of PC owners' homes...leading to ill will, more vehicle break-ins/thefts and a of degradation for the PC community.
 - Impact on the neighboring wild area: trash, unleashed and loose pets, and potentially unaware children going into the area; disruption of wildlife; and greater grass/wildfire exposure.
 - General impact on Pine Creek: decrease in home values, increased property crime, crowded D-20 schools
3. Public safety resources not able to keep up with the growth, so we can't even expect to have some notion of traffic control, let alone proactive crime patrolling, etc.
4. Generally, a poorly-chosen site for this development: size, traffic, lack of public transportation, difficulty getting kids to daycare and schools, zoning change from prior land-use.

In general, I am disappointed that the City of Colorado Springs has so poorly planned and reacted to the growth of this city. I realize that much of it can be blamed it on a longstanding conservative tradition of "no" or "low" taxes combined with a "build,build, build" mentality. I subscribe to neither of those civic "visions" but my Pine Creek neighbors and I will likely be living with the results as that is the way this city rolls.

Ann Kumm
3714 Palazzo Grove

On Thu, Nov 2, 2023 at 3:51 PM Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

The Royal Pines Apartments applicant has resubmitted the concept plan, development plan, updated traffic impact study and responses to neighbor comments. These documents have been distributed to city agencies for review, which will be complete by November 15th. You can view the proposed development plan, concept plan, and associated documents at ColoradoSprings.gov/LDRS by searching the record numbers COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141. By clicking the “record info” tab and then clicking “attachments,” the website will allow you to see the uploaded documents. If you wish to comment on the proposed plans, please send them to me by November 14th.

If there are no further city comments on the project following this review period, the applications will be referred to City Planning Commission for a public hearing. Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Thank you,

Logan Hubble

Planner II

30 S Nevada Ave. Suite 701

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

(719) 385-5099

Logan.Hubble@ColoradoSprings.gov



Hubble, Logan K

From: Kancir, Cindy <cindy.kancir@verizon.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 19, 2023 8:35 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Re: [E] COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141 - Royal Pines Apartments

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 still against this. I heard that the developers never did another traffic study like the residents asked. Please confirm if that is true or not.

Again, stop the building! Use the existing buildings we have. I am all for affordable housing, but flip (or upgrade) an old building and make that affordable housing. The developers could do something like that. We are losing sight of the beauty of our city, the very reason a lot of people moved here. I don't know, build a park instead! How about a community garden? Of course, that won't reap the city as much benefit right?

Please give me your honest opinion as to whether you think this will pass or not....Thanks.

Cindy
Resident of Pine Creek

On Fri, Oct 13, 2023 at 10:36 AM Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

City agencies have finished the third review of the Market at Pine Creek/Royal Pine Concept Plan and the second review of the Development Plan. I've just uploaded comments to Accela from myself and the rest of the reviewers. These can be viewed at [ColoradoSprings.gov/LDRS](https://coloradosprings.gov/LDRS). (Make sure you click on the "PROJECTS SUBMITTED **AFTER** AUGUST 8, 2022" button, as the project is only viewable through this portal. On the next page, simply type "DEPN-23-0141" or "COPN-23-0015" into the Record Number field and click search. This should take you to the record page.) I've also uploaded all of the citizen comments I have received thus far, to which the applicant will be required to respond. We are still accepting comments indefinitely, but any future comments will be uploaded following the next review.

As previously noted, this project will be referred to City Planning Commission without an administrative decision being made. However, this is not happening quite yet, as both the Concept Plan and the Development Plan require further changes to meet city standards.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Logan Hubble

Planner II

30 S Nevada Ave. Suite 701

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

(719) 385-5099

Logan.Hubble@ColoradoSprings.gov



--



Cindy Kancir

Project Manager
Unified Analytics and Insights
Verizon Business Group

O 719 535 1699
2424 Garden of the Gods Rd
Colorado Springs , CO 80919



Hubble, Logan K

From: Phil Moehlenpah <dpm056@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 6:45 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Eric Grodahl - COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141 Royal Pines Apartments

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!

Logan,

I am emailing you again regarding this proposed plan for a low income housing near my house.

I have emailed several times requesting that this project be moved elsewhere and spent numerous hours making appearances to inquire and see what can be done to not have this property built near Pine Creek.

The vast majority of the residents in Pine Creek don't want this built in our neighborhood. It is a fact that low income housing brings increased crime and drugs. It also brings down property values of high income areas. It is also true that the city should invest these types of projects in low income areas, not high income areas for the most efficient use of capital and ROI. This has been proven by numerous studies (Stanford University Study being one example) which I have sent to you and others, yet the information provided is getting ignored.

I specifically asked Eric Grodahl in one of the "informative sessions" - What will it take to not have him build this property at this location? He responded, "Nothing!". He proceeded to tell me in front of hundreds of people that it is a done deal because he is "politically connected". This developer isn't even from Colorado. All he cares about is the profits he and his family are going to make at our expense. I am sure he would never have this built in his own backyard. He is basically stealing from the local hard working men and women that have worked to be able to live in a desirable neighborhood, only to be discounting it, with the support of the Federal and Local government, by offering it to those that haven't earned it.

Logan, the peoples voices are being ignored and dismissed. The fact that the city has organized all of these sessions and not listening to the people, just dismissing concerns with lazy studies and weak rebuttals combined with the fact that the builder is so arrogant about having his political connections makes me believe this has all been a CHARADE! It appears that none of these community listening sessions were in good faith. We need our city to use the taxpayers resources wisely and care more about the residents here instead of a greedy developer from Oregon.

Sincerely,

D. P. Moehlenpah

Hubble, Logan K

From: Ed Perkett <itmatterz@msn.com>
Sent: Monday, October 16, 2023 9:16 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Apartment Royal Pine
Attachments: 20230929_070514.jpg; 20230929_070511.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!

This is the small round about departing our housing unit. In the past few months, there have been several accidents, that would have blocked the departure from the apartments completely

This is during warm weather, winter weather would be even worse

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Ed Perkett <itmatterz@msn.com>
Date: Oct 13, 2023 11:42 AM
Subject: Round
To: itmatterz@msn.com
Cc:

Hubble, Logan K

From: Paul Carson <ptcarson@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 8:37 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: Helms, Randy; Paul; Kris Tunehorst
Subject: Re: COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141 - Royal Pines Apartments

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 Hubble

I'm a resident of Pine Creek and strongly oppose the addition of subsidized apartments in the Royal Pine location because of:

- * there is a large surplus of apartments coming to market and there is no need for more. Vacancies are increasing.
- * there are many more locations that would not require the secret rezoning and violation of covenants.
- * traffic egress and entrances are not sufficient and will make the neighborhood streets much more dangerous and crowded
- * the subsidy of apartments with government money doesn't help lower incomes achieve home ownership equity, it only makes the developers wealthy. A better approach is to subsidize down payments on existing home stock that needs better ownership care.
- * crime is increasing throughout pine creek and the city. Multiple break ins and stolen vehicles all have had cases closed without investigation and no patrols. This new apartment will increase crime
- * the vast majority of homeowners in pine creek oppose changing zoning to allow subsidized loans to out of state wealthier investors.

I'm copying my supposed city council representative who has actively supported the project against his constituents. The mayor also heard opposition to this during his listening tour and is ignoring the electorate.

Paul Carson

> On Sep 28, 2023, at 2:22 PM, Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:
>
> COPN-23-0015

Hubble, Logan K

From: Georgia Wunsch <ga1ch331@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 8:30 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments

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. Hubble,

I am writing to express my disapproval of the Royal Pine Apartment development in the proximity of the Pine Creek neighborhood.

Some of the reasons I am against this complex are as follows:

1. There is only one exit into a round-about that then leads to a very slow light less than 100' when heading south towards Union (the main road traveled). There is no protected left (towards Powers Blvd), and the light gives priority to East/West traffic. When school is in session, the buses take this route and the light gets backed up enough to have to wait at least 5 minutes to get through it with no protected turn.
2. The negative effect of the addition of 300+ apartments with tenants possibly multiplied by 4 as an average family size. Where will the overflow parking be? In the surrounding businesses? In the surrounding Pine Creek neighborhood? The number of cars can potentially be multiplied by family members, relatives, friends- all sharing limited parking that as it is proposed will only accommodate the tenants. Street parking is out of the question because Royal Pine is a very narrow 2-lane road.
3. Limited services in close proximity with no public transportation closer than 1 mile.
4. The Pine Creek neighborhood consists primarily of single-family residences for a reason. Most residents enjoy the peacefulness of owning their little bit of space for quiet enjoyment, privacy from surrounding homes and businesses, and less noise and congestion than if we chose to live downtown. The lights alone coming from this complex will be a constant irritant.
5. The area where the proposed apartments are to be built has always been represented as a business park.
6. What happens if there is a fire or emergency and the only exit/ entrance is blocked? In addition to possibly 400-800 residences of the apartments, portions of the Pine Creek neighborhood may also need to evacuate via the same route. It seems not much thought or concern has gone into a traffic study to determine the level of traffic that regularly travels this route.
7. For all the same reasons the developers want to build this complex in the Pine Creek area, current residents have the same reasons why they disapprove of it being built.
8. The congestion, noise, overflow of people, lack of public transportation, restaurants, and limited jobs are all reasons to not pursue this development.
9. There is a wildlife area adjacent to the proposed complex. With so many animals living in the protected area, more people will likely lead to disruptions and displacement of the habitat, not to mention many deceased animals on the road.
10. Pine Creek Association is an HOA area that we as residents pay for to keep sidewalks plowed, all landscaping, lights, trash, etc. Allowing a large complex increasing the usage of these "private" areas will end up increasing the cost of every Pine Creek resident. It is completely unfair that we who have to budget like everyone else will be responsible for picking up the "tab" for all the use (and misuse) of Pine Creek Village grounds.

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

Georgia Wunsch

Pine Creek Resident

Hubble, Logan K

From: Scott Konnath <konnath@earthlink.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 12, 2023 7:41 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments Impact on Pine Manor Cut Thru Traffic

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 Logan,

Prior to 2020, I submitted a request for a traffic study of the speeding on Pine Manor past our park and school bus stops. If you are not familiar with the neighborhood near the proposed Royal Pines Apartment project, Pine Manor is basically a hill with several blind curves due to all the poorly maintained street trees along the road. I can't maintain the 30 mph speed limit without riding my brakes all the way down to Briargate Pkwy.

Before the traffic light went in at Pine Manor and Briargate Pkwy, we could not safely make a left turn out of our neighborhood onto Briargate Pkwy because of the speeding on Briargate Pkwy. Once the traffic light went in, motorcycle officers sat at the bottom of Pine Manor to catch speeders. Many of these speeders were from the Old Ranch Rd side of Pine Creek. These people soon realized if they cut thru Pine Manor, they could avoid 3 traffic lights and a ticket from the motorcycle officers.

The result of this traffic study was a need for traffic calming at Sycamore Glen Trail by our park. Unfortunately, the city put the stop sign and advance warning signs behind trees on the blind curve as you approach Sycamore Glen Trail from Royal Pines. After several people blew through this intersection by the park, people started complaining to the city. Instead of removing or trimming the street trees on the approach to the intersection, the city removed the 4-way stop since the traffic study was in error.

After Covid hit in 2020 and everyone worked and went to school remotely for over a year, the speeding and traffic volume decreased. Once we returned to normal life, the speeding problem returned.

I would like to know what the city is going to require the developer to do to proactively deter the cut thru traffic from this project? The city makes builders and developers of new single family communities install traffic measures for the impacts their community will cause. What does the traffic study of this high-density project entail? Do you think these residents are going to tolerate the Cordera favoring timing of the light at Royal Pine and Union or Powers and Union? Or are they going to bypass this light cutting thru Pine Manor or the neighborhood by Old Ranch Road? Looking at the roundabout exiting this project, why would anyone want to go Union? It is shorter to cut thru Pine Manor to get into town.

I would like to see true traffic calming measures required to be installed by this developer that will protect our kids going to the park or school bus stops from the increased traffic this project is going to create cutting thru our neighborhood. This includes something halfway down the hill at Sandflower Dr where the speeds start approaching 50 mph and a blind curve with a District 20 bus stop just past the roundabout. District 20 said they cannot stop in the roundabout because residential roundabout medians are considered divided highways in traffic codes.



Scott Konnath

Pinebrook Way Resident

719-258-0789

Hubble, Logan K

From: B1Dobbs <brookedobbins5@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 9:49 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Comments on The Market at Royal Pine

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 Logan,

Please see my comments below on the developers responses to community questions. Thought I would take this approach instead of asking open ended questions because the developer's response and the way the city is handling this is inadequate. I directly copied their document and my comments are in red.

Again, my issues are not with the developer, it's with how City Planning is allowing this to happen in the first place.

----- BEGINNING OF DEVELOPER COMMENTS -----

Traffic/Egress

A draft Traffic Impact Study was submitted with the Development Plan. This study identified that the proposed multi-family use is a lower trip generator than the previously proposed commercial uses. The study has been updated recently to address recent neighborhood concerns and City comments as well as utilizing new traffic counts and turning movement data collected with school back in session. **But it was still conducted while there was construction on Pine Manor and Old Ranch so the city traded one traffic impediment for another. An accurate count during peak times has still not been conducted which is oddly coincidental.** In addition to providing the updated study, the data shows that the development complies with the original intent of the Concept Plan, which restricts the total daily trip count for the development area to 8,441 (total trip generation is only at 2,257). **This response is misleading because the maximum trips is 8,441 while current trips is 4,378 according to the equally misleading traffic count in September. This puts the total expected trips on Royal Pine near the development to be 6,635. While the 8k mark is the absolute maximum, our community will feel the impact of this drastic increase in traffic.** The team also explored expanding access to Union Blvd., but it is not feasible due to Colorado Department of Transportation (CDOT) regulations and access restrictions. According to Home COS within the Executive Summary, working families are frustrated by a lack of larger apartments located near employment, schools, shopping centers, transit, and low-cost child-care. While affordable and attainable housing is under-supplied citywide, the issue is particularly acute in the northern region. **Where is the data to show that affordable housing or even apartments in Colorado Springs is undersupplied? I've read various articles that suggest we are becoming overdeveloped and will suffer the consequences very soon. I've linked articles below this section I'd like the Developer or City Planning to explain.** North of Woodmen Road, property values tend to be higher, and there are fewer than 1,000 constructed, under construction and planned, including Royal Pine Apartments. These apartments will shorten commuting times for its residents, lowering traffic burdens for the City.

https://gazette.com/premium/report-shows-vacancy-rates-are-spiking-in-colorado-springs-will-more-apartments-mean-cheaper-rent/article_eae9421e-1d04-11ee-ba54-c7346f3cea7e.html

https://www.csbj.com/news/colorado-springs-apartment-market-likely-to-be-overbuilt/article_2d377372-f346-11ed-924d-abb6039b19e8.html

Parking

While the originally proposed number of 309 parking spaces was compliant with the City's land use requirements for this development, the development team increased the parking by 30 spaces, or roughly 10% percent above the City's Code

requirements in order to be responsive to the neighbors' concerns. With 339 total parking spaces now, the community will have a ratio of roughly 0.9 parking spaces per bedroom, as opposed to roughly 0.8 parking spaces per bedroom previously. It is important to note that the parking was increased without sacrificing any usable open space. In DBG's experience, which includes the management of more than 7,500 affordable units across 40 communities in six Western States including Colorado Springs, adequate parking ratios vary between 0.8 and 1.0 parking spaces per bedroom for affordable family communities. Certain sites in more urban or transit-oriented locations as well as senior communities usually justify lower ratios. **What is the city and/or property management going to do to prevent tenants from parking in the adjacent business' parking lot and the neighborhood? I've personally lived in an apartment multiple times, a one bedroom usually with a roommate and we both had our own cars. Usually a family with 2 adults has at least 2 cars. How does 0.9 parking spaces per room make sense? Where are the numbers?**

Lack of input from neighborhood / Public engagement

The development team has significantly exceeded the City requirements in terms of neighborhood outreach. The developer has hosted two voluntary informational sessions (in addition to the required city-sponsored neighborhood meeting), responded to countless emails, conducted several individual phone calls, met in-person with multiple residents in their homes and has provided his contact information to anyone interested. **This issue isn't with the developer, it's with the city. Both postcards to residents within 1,000 feet had wrong and misleading information on them. The 1,000ft rule is also the most ludicrous thing I have ever experienced when it impacts a whole neighborhood. One of the secondary "egress" points is my primary egress so how does this not impact me? I'm less than a mile away and if there were to be a fire, I would not be able to escape according to the fire evacuation modeling we've researched.**

Lack of, or overcrowding of supporting services, e.g. medical, schools, transportation

Multifamily is a by-right use of the site, **It was only a by-right use of the site for Multifamily because of ReetoolCOS which is essentially a hall pass for developers to build wherever they want even if it wasn't originally planned for that area. That phrase "by-right" use is extremely misleading if you don't know the history. That only became the case this last summer.** and the development will pay all required impact fees to the City. These fees are designed to fund critical infrastructure, parks, open space, schools and transportation. Increasing population density can also lead to additional funding for bus lines, classroom expansion, etc. **Will the developer be required to pay the same per square-foot for each unit that I as a homeowner have to pay towards the same taxes per year? Or is it only a one time fee? I don't see how the fees fund critical infrastructure at the same rate homeowners are required to pay for them.**

Crime

This development will be professionally managed. Background and credit checks for every resident will be conducted. At a minimum, the site manager and lead technician will live onsite as well.

Property values

There is no empirical evidence to suggest that this type of housing will negatively impact home values in Colorado Springs, **Why did they say "Colorado Springs" here and not specifically Briargate or Pine Creek? This is a very shady response. Please see details below from a study at Stanford. Again, where are the numbers?** as corroborated by analysis conducted by Community Development. DBG Properties has also studied home values in neighborhoods where it has developed, and there is no correlation to impact on home values. This data was split further to specific neighborhoods in higher income areas, and no correlation was found. **Where is the data? Where is this study?**

<https://www.gsb.stanford.edu/insights/affordable-housing-good-neighborhood#:~:text=The%20study%20revealed%20that%20an,mile%20of%20an%20LIHTC%20project.>

Direct quote from study above: "In the high-income areas, you saw a strong housing price drop very locally, and then it radiated outward over time," McQuade says. The price effects remain even after 10 years, Diamond adds."

<https://www.csus.edu/college/social-sciences-interdisciplinary-studies/public-policy-administration/internal/documents/thesis-bank/thesis-bank-2018-wahid.pdf>

Another direct quote: "Regarding the impact of household size on the final selling price of properties sold in the last quarter of 2013, the results show that an increase in household size by 0.53 persons per household (one unit rise from the average household size) caused the 81 final selling price to decline by 8.1 percent."

As a first time home buyer in a very tumultuous market, this greatly worries me. With the way 401ks and Social Securities are going, our home value could be the only thing that keeps us above water. The developer's response is very piss poor and is also the responsibility of the City. Part of the UDC is that the City cannot do anything that will negatively impact our property values so I'd like the City to prove to me they are not intentionally causing a situation where the value of our livelihood will drop. If our house value drops significantly from this, I very much doubt the property taxes will and they already doubled this last year for us which was very unexpected. I have seen many studies that imply this development is guaranteed to negatively impact our property values and no evidence to the contrary.

Noise

The development will shut down all amenities, with the exception of the indoor fitness center, after 10pm and will be enforced by onsite management at a minimum. This does conform with the current Concept Plan and is true of all DBG developments. The development team also designed the site with the highest intensity of the development farthest away from the neighboring residential community, and the team believes the buildings will actually mitigate noise from Powers Blvd. As a long term owner, builder and manager, DBG has also committed to keeping the lines of communication open with the neighborhood during construction and into the future.

Light pollution

Light pollution for residences, particularly along Royal Pine Drive, is of concern for the development team after hearing from neighbors. The development team has focused on creating appropriate landscape buffers along Royal Pine Drive, designed the parking in a way that minimizes the cars facing those residences directly, and will implement shorter light poles near the clubhouse and surrounding parking that are closer to existing residential development. **I've never seen a baby tree as big as a light pole. I've also never seen a tree as big as a 4 story building to block lights that may be coming from tenants.**

Overall density

The density complies with all zoning regulations. The development team did weigh the option of 3-story buildings with the same unit count, but that scenario would have eliminated almost all open space, lowered the value of the buildings (e.g. no elevator) and pushed buildings closer to the neighborhood. The 4-story buildings also allow chutes to contain trash inside the building. **We have asked MANY times about reducing the number of units to accommodate 3-story buildings and retain all open space. No one cares that the developer looked into 3-story buildings with no open space. That has never been the question. Of course, the developer has ignored this question because it becomes a slightly less profitable situation for them. If they were truly invested in the well-being of our community, they would have considered reducing the amount of units. They listed everywhere else what they've "considered" yet not stated they considered reducing the amount of units for some reason even though it was a direct ask.**

Line of sight to directly adjacent neighbors

As discussed above, the development will invest in a robust landscape buffer along Royal Pine Drive. The orientation of the buildings was designed in such a way to pull the buildings away from existing residential properties as much as possible, while also minimizing the number of units directly facing the residences within the confines of the site. The clubhouse building will also help obstruct views directly into the residences. As an aside, the development team did consider adding a 3-story building near the clubhouse, but elected against it with this concern in mind. **I doubt the Pine Creek residents directly across the road care about what the developer considered. There are still units that will be able to see directly their backyards and homes so the problem is not resolved. I would be moving without question if I were in that position.**

Wildlife preservation

The development team is concerned with the impact on the surrounding environment. As discussed above, trash chutes will eliminate most of the trash from sitting outside the building. Larger trash pickup areas will be designed to be wildlife

friendly in order to prevent animal entry. All storm runoff will comply with approved City criteria. This project does not abut the existing preservation area along Pine Creek, rather a 4-acre lot, zoned for commercial use exists between this project and the preservation area. This development will also improve the existing infrastructure and clean up the current state of the Market at Pine Creek. **Why is the current state of the Market at Pine Creek needing improvement? Additional noise, light, traffic won't contribute to harassment of the preserve? If there are any preble mouse still there, they sure won't be there after this development.**

Infrastructure Shortages – Water, Sewer, Transportation

Water, sewer and electric infrastructure as well as improved offsite work was previously completed as part of the Market at Pine Creek site work. All of the existing infrastructure in place is adequate to serve the proposed development, so this is a very low impact development in terms of infrastructure. All stormwater drainage systems will be evaluated and approved by the City. Existing road infrastructure was accounted for in the current Concept Plan, and this development complies with all such intents related to traffic and access. **With two roundabouts as the only egress that also need to be shared with the businesses in the same area? If this meets city criteria for evacuation and infrastructure, then the city is grossly undeserving their residents and those businesses.** This is further supported by independent study through a full traffic impact analysis in coordination with the City and the fire department. **This is a lie and does not take into account the construction that was taking place during the traffic count.** Additionally, the development team believes that this community will serve to enhance the current infrastructure in place. The Market at Pine Creek, as it currently stands, includes an unfinished road through the property, exposed utilities and has been used as a trash dumping site (e.g. abandoned treadmills have sat for months). **I'll go pick up the treadmill if it is such an eyesore but I doubt any of the residents mind as there aren't a plethora of trash there nor are there people loitering.** Not only would this be cleaned up with this development, but DBG would also step in as the Common Area Manager for the Market at Pine Creek. Currently it is managed by the owner of DBG's contracted site, who has not invested in the area and are not local to the site. **What does 'managed by the owner of DBG's contracted site' mean? How can the site be contracted by DBG but owned by someone else? I thought the purchase hasn't been finalized yet.** The project will comply with all applicable energy codes and include a large solar component in excess of typical multifamily projects. The energy efficiency will be a selling point for sustainable development. (See below)

Out of state developer

DBG Properties is a long-term owner, builder and manager of all its communities, and thus views itself as a stakeholder in every community in which it develops. The company has more than 1,000 multifamily units either completed, under construction, or in planning across Colorado, including Academy Heights in Colorado Springs. Four employees on the construction team permanently reside in Colorado Springs, and all management personnel live either onsite or nearby. Additionally, the larger development team is composed of local owner's representatives, designers and financial partners. The Principal of DBG, Eric Grodahl, lived in Colorado previously for 3 years and visits frequently. **They would not have picked such a small plot and offered an insane amount to the owner if it weren't for the profit from the bonds or the unrealized gains of being in a growing city. The developers already here are just as greedy so I don't think that was the point of this community comment... We're asking why does the developer care so much about this specific plot and what assurances can they give that they are invested in this community?**

Fire Evacuation

Consistent with the comments on traffic, city engineers and the fire department must sign off on all evacuation plans concerning this development in order to be approved. **Logan, I specifically saw 'No Comment' from the Fire Department on the last review and was told that could also mean they never responded. How is this a required sign off?** Per the Office of Emergency Management, incident commands will be set and directed by either CSFD or CSPD depending upon the situation and zone within the City. The Royal Pine Apartment project is within zone 1236. The November 2021 PPROEM Evacuation Plan provides guidance for evacuations in the event of an emergency. There are numerous egress points from the Pine Creek neighborhood that would be directed by CSPD or CSFD in the event of an emergency event. **One of those egress points is also my primary egress point along with half of the neighborhood on the North side of Pine Creek. The next nearest egress point to me is a mile away and through the neighborhood. If I were to use my current egress point in an emergency, it's estimated it'll take me 8 hours to evacuate. In what world is the fire department doing their modeling?? Because it is not in my neighborhood.**

Development will strain external community resources, e.g. private parks, street parking

The development as currently designed will feature ~123,000 SF of total open space, ~47,000 SF of outdoor amenity space and a stand-alone clubhouse. The requirement for total open space provided is 76,800 SF (200 SF * 384 rooms), which this development far exceeds. Outdoor onsite amenities will include a play structure, dog run, community gardens, bike racks, pet relief stations, picnic benches, open grass and other gathering areas. Indoor amenities include a stand-alone clubhouse with a fitness center, community room and kitchen, leasing office, mail and parcel, and a courtyard. **This is not going to stop residents from using our community park and sidewalks when the space provided by the complex becomes crowded. Colorado Springs is one of the most dog friendly cities in the country. We stayed in an apartment off of Academy that had a small "dog park" which was crowded every afternoon to nightfall. That many dogs in a small space will cause dog fights which we saw at that complex daily. Educated owners will instead take their dog elsewhere or on a walk. And guess which neighborhood has the nicest areas to walk because the HOA pays for it? Pine Creek. This will undoubtedly cause our HOA dues to rise all because the City refuses to say no to any developer due to RetoolCOS.** As discussed above related to parking, the development team is exploring options to increase the parking count above code without sacrificing open space.

Design fit with character of neighborhood

As a long-term owner of all its properties, DBG places a premium on design that supports the neighborhood. Simply, properties that are designed appropriately are more desirable for residents and perform better over time in terms of rent, vacancy and turnover. The site plan and design has evolved throughout this process with input from stakeholders, including the neighbors. For example, the development team has incorporated trash chutes and wildlife friendly parcel refuse areas, lower light poles in the front of the development to reduce light pollution, bolstered landscape buffers from single family residences along Royal Pine Drive, designed the site in a way that moves the taller buildings closer to Powers Boulevard and reduces line of sight into neighboring homes, explored additional ingress/egress along Union Boulevard (denied by CDOT), and increased parking counts by 10% without eliminating usable open space. Additionally, the proposed community is part of the Briargate Crossing Commercial Master Plan, **How is it a part of the Master Plan? Pretty sure La Platta did not plan for this when Briargate was first being developed. Additionally, the apartments we already have on the other side of Pine Creek contribute to the HOA. I don't see this development doing the same.** which has a Design Review Board (DRB) that must approve all development plans as part of the approval process. The very intention of the DRB is to ensure that all development fits the character of the neighborhood. DBG has worked closely with the DRB throughout this process and has obtained DRB approval of the Development Plan.

Development is not in the public's interest

Affordable housing has been an enormous challenge for the City of Colorado Springs. **Says who and when was that data updated? Please reference the articles above about Colorado Springs being overbuilt.** According to Home COS, the City's population is growing at nearly 2% annually, making it one of the fastest growing areas in the Mountain West. **And apartments have grown by more than 2% each year so how is that a justifiable response?** In response, the primary objective of Home COS has been to add 1,000 affordable units per year. **Uh huh and 12,000 apartments are currently under construction. According to the Gazette, that means almost 4,000 units are going to be added to the market over the next 3 years. And none of those are going to be affordable?** Housing cost inflation has pushed essential workers into older and less secure housing options, often great distances from employment opportunities and essential services. Royal Pine Apartments contributes significantly to the stated objectives of the City's housing policy.

Solar Component

The current development plan calls for solar to power all common areas of the site, and that the panels are currently proposed on the roof.

Tenant Vetting

Please reference the Crime section of this memorandum. As a long-term owner and a federally regulated program, the owner has a strong incentive to create a safe community for all of its residents.

Property Upkeep

There are clear standards of conduct in DBG's properties, and they are managed accordingly. Management personnel will live on site to manage upkeep, which is consistent across the DBG portfolio. There are additional levels of control over operations, including regional and executive management oversight and owner.

----- END OF DEVELOPER COMMENTS -----

Here's another article that does a good job of summing up the tragedies and issues with "affordable housing": <https://newrepublic.com/article/161806/affordable-housing-public-housing-rent-los-angeles>

We should be learning from cities like LA and Portland who have gone through this rollercoaster before and ended up turning their city upside down because of the same mistakes we're making.

I would greatly appreciate a response to my questions and comments from a City Planner and not necessarily the developer; however, I would still like my comments to become part of the public record. At this point, the developer is going to say whatever it takes to push this through and it's really the discernment of City Planning and City Council to see that this development will be catastrophic for our community.

Thanks,
Brooke Dobbins

Hubble, Logan K

From: davepuerta@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 7:58 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartment Development Meeting

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. Hubble, I have attached our thoughts on the above Apartment Complex. There are several available sites that better meet the needs of this Demographic and must be considered before this complex is advanced.

There are eleven Development Plan Review Criteria that must be considered before a complex of this magnitude is to be approved.. The Pine Creek Development doesn't come close to being acceptable to at least ten of the necessary criteria.

Criteria follows:

Compliance with Relevant Plans. This plot was zoned for medical offices of three stories and City Council change d the zoning for multi unit apartments.

Use-Specific Standards. Note above.

Compatibility with Surroundings. Impact will effect two existing Medical Offices and will become both a financial and security threat.

Off-Site Impacts. Insufficient ground for recreational use and there is a Natural Preserve next to proposed location. In addition there is no local mass transit and inadequate police and fire protection. Colorado School District is already over class room size mandates and is currently working from on site trailers. There are no plans for additional bus transportation. There are few employment opportunities within reasonable distances.

Dimensional Standards. Inadequate space for vehicle parking and no apparent vehicle charging stations. Parking will overflow to existing businesses.

Environmental Protections. Site is adjacent to a Natural Wildlife Preserve and may become a playground for children which will endanger them and the "protected wildlife".

Utilities. Will require infrastructure increases for both electricity and water/sewage.

Traffic and Mobility. Probably the most important. Entrance and egress onto a one lane roundabout will be restrained during peak hours and emergency situations.

There are better sites available which will benefit both the existing residences and apartment dwellers. The city should suspend consideration of this site and do their job in finding a better solution. Dave Donelson has expressed his concern for this proposal and it is time for the City to listen to our neighbors and the negative impact this will have on the existing residents and proposed apartment dwellers.

David Puerta
davepuerta@comcast.net

Hubble, Logan K

From: Jacque Rindgen-DeCecco <jrindgendececco@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 7:44 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Opposing the Proposed Multi-Family Apartment 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!

Logan,

I am writing because I oppose the proposed development referred to as the Royal Pine Apartments to be located in the vicinity of Royal Pine Drive, Union Blvd., and Powers (4180 Royal Pine Drive). I have numerous concerns that still have NOT been addressed by the developer (DBG). My concerns are as follows:

1. Has an Environmental Impact Assessment been completed for this proposed apartment complex, and associated infrastructure, to assess the extent of impact to the existing flora and fauna -- to include the downstream riparian habitat and the wildlife that inhabit that critical ecosystem?
2. It is my belief that the proposal will have an increase in vehicular traffic in an area that the existing road infrastructure cannot support. As a result, it is believed that there will be an increase in accidents due to the number of people trying to enter/exit the proposed property in addition to the traffic congestion that is generated from the existing residential communities. How will the road infrastructure be modified to alleviate this vehicular hazard by the developer?
3. In addition, how will the developer accommodate the parking dilemma that will occur from the number of vehicles that will be brought into the area with the residents because the addition of a few more spaces will not adequately accommodate the apartment complex's parking requirements? The current documents state that only a reduced number of parking spaces are required for this type of development but as we all know there will be more vehicles than the available, developed parking spaces. Where will the overflow be housed?
4. How is the developer proposing to handle the increased overland flow of water as a result of the proposed development?
5. I am concerned that the proposed development site will not be able to sustainably support the change in land use from commercial with temporary stressors to continuous-use stressors. How is that being taken into consideration and what mitigation measures are being implemented to reduce the constant stressors on the surrounding areas as well as the proposed development site?
6. The Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse riparian habitat, adjacent to the proposed development site, will be directly impacted since it is within the natural drainage area of the proposed site location. How is the developer addressing this critical habitat preservation?
7. I have a question regarding the increased population density brought in by the proposed development specifically a comment by Caroline Miller (Planning): "This change from Commercial to Residential will trigger multiple City Ordinances due to an increase in residential density: the Parkland Dedication Ordinance, the school Ordinance, and Citywide Development Impact Fees." Under the Parkland Dedication Ordinance new residential units create new park land obligations based upon residential multifamily units being created. Is the developer being offered the ability to pay fees

in lieu of creating parkland obligations and how will paying fees, if selected by the developer, affect the land resources of this land? What will be the impact then to the increase in parkland use on existing community parklands?

8. This is a continuation of my question based on Caroline Miller (Planning) comment above: Will the existing Police and Fire have the resources/budget to be able to support this influx in proposed residential density?

9. District 20, specifically Pine Creek High School/Mountainview Elementary School/Challenger Middle School, currently has difficulty providing bus transportation for their existing students. How will the influx in proposed school-age children be transported to and from school when the existing bus transportation system is severely challenged?

I am of the belief that the proposed location is not the right location for this development. From the last meeting that was held it appears as though the city is not hearing our community concerns especially since our concerns are not being addressed by the developers and I feel as though the city is not looking out for the interests of the current community residents. I look forward to hearing responses to my above questions. Thank you for your time.

Jacque Rindgen-DeCecco

Hubble, Logan K


From: stcglen@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 6:29 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: stcglen@comcast.net
Subject: RE: Comments version 2 (Glendenning)_COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141 - Royal Pines Apartments

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!

Version 2—please use this one as my most recent version and replace the one sent at 1:39 AM

Logan,

I once again ask for a rejection of this project as it does not address the concerns we have continually brought up regarding the bottleneck this project will cause at the Royal Pine Dr roundabout. For emergency situations in particular, most notably fire, every single vehicle in our vicinity will need to go through a single lane roundabout to access the primary designated egress route. In multiple events, most recently and notably Maui, we have witnessed how dangerous it is to bottleneck and/or limit ingress/egress points to neighborhoods. What is being ignored is that at least one or more of these routes will be further bottlenecked with emergency vehicles should a bad situation arise, such as a brush fire in the nature preserve area for example. In the most recent tragedy at Maui, we saw how fast moving a fire can become especially when exacerbated by high winds which are common to the Colorado Springs area. Forcing us to go through to either secondary egress will be a much slower and backed up route for many of us, potentially trapping us in our own neighborhoods. I understand this is worst case scenario, but that is what you should cater to and must strongly consider.



Secondly, we have successfully maintained a nature preserve within this neighborhood since inception. Adding another 400+ people in close proximity in a condensed area will inevitably add trash to the preserve area. More people leads to more garbage, whether purposeful or accidental trash. Regardless, the trash will accumulate over time and when blown away by the wind will take the path of least resistance towards the Nature Preserve—a Styrofoam/plastic coffee cup, fast food bag, candy wrapper, and potato chip bag here and there. There are no effective barriers in the proposal to prevent that. I took pictures on June 19th of this year of the general area within and just beyond the lot and it is already littered with trash with very few people in the vicinity other than the businesses, so adding 400+ people will add to that problem significantly. This is one of the few neighborhoods with a Nature Preserve within the confines of the neighborhood—let’s respect that and keep it protected. It is home to deer, coyotes, elk, and bears to name a few.







Lastly, if the above concerns along with those of my fellow neighbors can be adequately addressed and this project is approved I ask for a redesign of the proposed complex to better fit with the neighborhood design. This is a premier neighborhood and it deserves a premier design plan. If you allow an unsightly complex then you will affect valuations, hence the reason we have an HOA which manages our neighborhood to ensure projects meet certain design specifications (i.e. color, style, etc.). To be blunt, the current proposed Royal Pine complex design is ugly—don't let

them get away with it. They have been offered a substantial amount of bond money, so obligate them to put it to use via a complete redesign fitting to the \$800K - \$1 million dollar homes which are just a block or two away.

Royal Pines proposed design—ugly, plain, square, unappealing



Nearby La Bella Vista apartment complex—vibrant, pleasant, appealing, high quality (Picture #1)



Nearby La Bella Vista apartment complex—vibrant, pleasant, appealing, high quality (Picture #2)



Nearby La Bella Vista apartment complex—vibrant, pleasant, appealing, high quality (Picture #3)



Thanks for your consideration.

Steven Glendenning
Pine Creek/Orchard Park Trail
719-641-9484

Hubble, Logan K

From: Holly Lawrence <honorville@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 5:04 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Traffic Concerns Royal Pine Apartments

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!

A high density apartment on Royal Pines will contribute to more traffic in this area.
this is on Old Ranch.

This is from the recent Pine Creek High School Newsletter.

We have seen 2 wrecks ourselves in 2 months. The safety is compromised by overcrowding in a school and neighborhood.



Traffic Safety

-
- This intersection is recognized as a dangerous spot by the Colorado Springs Police Department. Abiding by traffic rules is essential.
-

Holly Lawrence

MTR- Mobile Transport Repair

3435 Astrozon Court

Colorado Springs, CO 80910

(719) 491-3192

www.MobileTransportRepair.com

Hubble, Logan K

From: Laura Wilkey <laura.wilkey@exprealty.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 4:38 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Not giving up!

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 Logan,

It's very disappointing that people are saying the Pine Creek Apartments are a done deal, and what we say doesn't matter. I hope that is not true! If it is, perhaps they can maybe reduce the stories and number of apartments so it won't be as disruptive. There are SO MANY apartments and homes for rent that are vacant. Why would we need more when N Powers has new apartments and condos already?

Thank you for your time.

Laura Wilkey

Hubble, Logan K

From: Holly Lawrence <honorville@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 4:01 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments

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 submit my objection to the planned Royal pine apartments.
Safety is priority

1. Traffic - Union and Royal Pine are in a list of high accident sights already
2. School overcrowding- District has no voice - Pine Creek is over capacity- intersection to get to Pine Creek High School is also on a list for dangerous - high accidents- (my husband already saw 2 this school year , including a roll over!)
3. Zoning is not compatible and does not follow the master plan.
4. wildlife refuge would be at risk.

There are many more concerns. We want Smart Development with proper infrastructure.

Holly Lawrence

MTR- Mobile Transport Repair
3435 Astrozon Court
Colorado Springs, CO 80910
(719) 491-3192
www.MobileTransportRepair.com

Hubble, Logan K

From: Robbie Weber <busymom.rest@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 3:53 PM
To: All Council - DL; Hubble, Logan K; Helms, Randy; Posey, Steve; Yemi Mobolade
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141

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 Mayor Mobolade, Mr. Hubble and City Council:

I am writing to express my grave safety concerns about evacuation hindrances in the event of fires and other disasters if the high density Royal Pine apartment complex is developed in the Pine Creek area. This area was in pre-evacuation mode during the 2013 Black Forest fire which destroyed approximately 500 homes. With Pine Creek Village's close proximity to the Black Forest and its large amount of wildlife fuels that easily spread with our area's frequent winds, dangerous evacuation conditions would occur in the event of another wildfire in Black Forest or surrounding areas. Many more homes have been built in Cordera and North Fork since the 2013 Black Forest fire which adds to this concern, creating a much larger number of residents now in the area to hinder evacuation routes.

Many roundabouts in Pine Creek would create an enormous amount of traffic congestion as they funnel all traffic into a single circle. This would greatly hinder efforts to evacuate the neighborhood even if police arrive to direct both lanes of Royal Pine Dr. and other local roads' traffic to flow in one direction out of the area. Adding hundreds of additional residents in an apartment complex in the small area next to one of these roundabouts creates an extremely dangerous situation for thousands of people. This congestion would also prevent emergency vehicles from gaining access to burning homes and residents in need of medical aid in Pine Creek.

Lahaina, Maui's recent tragedy where a wildfire killed 115 people and destroyed over 2,000 homes and businesses shows how dangerous congested evacuations can be. Maui's tragic deaths resulted from many getting trapped in their cars during congested evacuations and many of the homes and businesses destroyed couldn't be reached by firefighters due to the clogged roadways. Please prevent this development of high-density apartment housing in Pine Creek to preserve the safety of its residents and the potential apartment dwellers so as to avoid a tragedy similar to the one experienced in Maui.

My other concerns about this development involve health issues from having additional traffic congestion causing more air pollution.

In addition, local schools which are already overcrowded and dealing with teacher shortages will face a large increase in student populations which will reduce the quality of education for all D20 students.

Also, the area's infrastructure was not developed to accommodate this large number of additional housing units and would realize additional burdens.

The adjacent endangered Preble's jumping mouse habitat would likely be disturbed. Children without backyards will likely walk over there to play.

Please realize these negative impacts on Pine Creek Village and surrounding neighborhoods' residents and wildlife and stop the development of this high-density apartment complex on Royal Pine Dr.

Thank you for your consideration.

Ms. Robbie Weber

Hubble, Logan K

From: mail2srv@aol.com
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 2:39 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments - Opposition

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 Logan,

I am writing to voice my continued opposition to the proposed Royal Pines Apartments. The top reasons include:

- Overcrowding of D20 schools - Pine Creek High School in particular has 1900 students. Mountain View Elementary crowded.
- Bottlenecked fire and emergency evacuation routes. No study performed.
- Added traffic - studies done at opportune times benefitting the developer (business as usual for City Planning)
- Zoning use is inappropriate as CC&Rs for the land state commercial.
- Size and function of Royal Pine Apartments is not architecturally compatible with the surrounding neighborhood
- No wildlife impact assessment was performed.
- Insufficient facilities such as parks, shopping, and bus routes for proposed residents.
- Insufficient parking for capacity of building
- Strong neighborhood opposition
- City Planning did not following its own development plan that was distributed to Pine Creek residents. (business as usual for City Planning)

Thank you,

Sandra Vicksta

Hubble, Logan K

From: Colm Toomey <colm.toomey@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 2:32 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines/Pine Creek

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 Logan Hubble,

We are writing to you as concerned Pine Creek residents in relation to the proposed development of 232 dwelling units at Royal Pines Apartments.

We want to register our objection to this development on the grounds of density/traffic.

We do not believe this development is appropriate for the existing low density neighborhood which was never planned or designed for this. The local infrastructure is completely inadequate to support this number of added dwelling units/families without significant additional investment by the city, which does not appear to be part of the plan.

On the traffic side of things we understand the intention is to have all the vehicles located in this 232 unit development exit from the 3 building complex at Royal Pine. This will inevitably lead to significant congestion at this location making this - one of only three egress routes from Pine Creek - effectively unusable, particularly in the event of an emergency. We would also expect this to turn Pine Manor into an even busier thoroughfare route, increasing safety concerns for residents and children playing at the PVCA park.

Please consider our views on this as fellow citizens, local residents and taxpayers and find a more suitable alternative location for this development. We believe this is in the best interests of current Pine Creek residents and the future residents of the proposed development, as well as the city.

I look forward to your response.

Sincerely,
Colm and Lynda Toomey
3055 Hollycrest Dr, Colorado Springs.

Hubble, Logan K

From: Joseph Bala <josephbala@live.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 1:31 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: Jessica Bala
Subject: Objection to COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141

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 Logan Hubble:

I am copying my previous objections to this development below as they are still valid but I also want to add more comments.

I find it appalling that such high density development can be considered to be placed so near low density development. It just does not fit into the area. Why is there such a lack of 'planning' (I use that term loosely) when it comes to reviewing these proposals. The developer should have been laughed out of the room when this plan was first proposed.

Driving around COS I see so many apartment buildings going up, who are all the people that are going to fill them? We are growing too fast and need to slow down. Not every inch of land needs to have a building on it.

Can we please use some logic and realize that if you drive out to this site (when was the last time you actually went to the site?) that adding a huge apartment complex is going to ruin the area? Can't we have anything nice?

Why is there such a push to allow this development, this is going to be nothing but a money pit for COS in terms of costs for police to keep ticketing the trespassers into the nature area, cost for increased road wear, cost for increased accidents, cost for increased pollution, costs for increased complaints from existing homeowners. Lets use some common sense and deny this development.

Lets be smart and put in some small medical offices - dentists seem to be popping up everywhere- why not here instead of high density apartments.

Also, how about taking a drive over to the apartments across Powers near Target. Do this after 5pm and you will see the PUBLIC roads covered in parked cars because there is not enough parking at that complex- the same will happen here and be a disaster.

Original email-

As a concerned homeowner and taxpayer living very near the proposed project site, I object to the development of multi-family apartment complex containing 232 units at the corner of Royal Pine Drive and Union Blvd. for the following reasons:

Environmental Concerns

The wildlife habitat on both sides of Royal Pine Drive are at risk of damage, destruction and fire by increasing a large number of non property owning residents who have no viable recreation area and have no ownership interest in the area. Where are the children of residents going to play? They are not welcome at the PRIVATE Pine Creek Park and they are not going to walk all the way to John Venezia Park. They will want to play in the wildlife habitat putting deer, mice, squirrels, bobcats, lynx, birds of all kinds and more at risk. All it will take is one cigarette from one of these residents to ignite the field on a dry summer day.

Overlooked Taxpayer Financial Burdens

The City approved the intent to issue a \$40 million bond for this development, but rising interest rates may cause unexpected losses and residents should be worried about undisclosed taxpayer costs for additional services related to the project. Who is going to pay for the increased police needed to issue citations for all the people from this proposed development illegally trespassing in the wildlife area?

Traffic and Transportation Concerns

There is simply not enough road transportation on the proposed plan with only the one single lane roundabout as the egress point. How are 400+ people (assuming at a minimum 2 people per unit) going to get in and out of there during busy times of going to work and coming home? Traffic will be backed up all over Royal Pine and Union Blvd. The number of accidents, injuries and lost time that will result will not be worth to have this development.

Negative Impact and Disregard for Local Small Businesses

The established, thriving local small businesses already located next to the proposed site are going to suffer. How will they be able to keep access to their business open and parking lots free of non-customers with so many additional residential units nearby? How is it fair that the site was planned to be for light commercial use gets turned into low income high density housing that these small businesses did not plan for in their own site selection?

I request that the proposed project be DENIED, and reconsider future development plans within Colorado Springs to account for the voice of the community and have smart, thought out city planning. How about the right thing is done and some small, commercial, professional buildings and businesses are allowed to build as was originally intended?

I look forward to your prompt response.

Yours sincerely,

Joseph Bala

Hubble, Logan K

From: Dan Harfert <dan.harfert@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 1:10 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Concerns with MF Development at Royal Pine

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 Logan

I am writing to express additional concerns about the multi-family housing development planned at Royal Pine Drive.

The update from CDOT that an additional egress on Union not being permitted creates a great safety concern. Royal Pine will be a primary evacuation route for Pine Creek residents in the event of a fire. Within Pine Creek, the Orchard Park, Sycamore Glen, La Bellezza, Heartwood, Oak Meadow, and Oak Knoll regions would naturally take Royal Pine as their shortest path out. This are approximately 450 homes in those regions and in a high stress moment or depending on the direction of the evacuation, the number of homes evacuating through this location could easily grow much higher.

For the purposes of discussion, I will stick with those 450 homes though a plan for a worst case scenario is what really should be modeled. Looking to an evacuation, there will be an average of more than one car leaving the neighborhood per home. Lets assume it is 1.5 cars on average or 675 cars going through the roundabout. Add in the >400 cars that are planned for the multi-family development and we are talking about over 1000 cars trying to leave an area simultaneously.

The issue with the evacuation is everyone going through the roundabout, more specifically a single lane roundabout. Roundabouts are designed for safety mostly *at the expense* of speed as the posted 30-mph on Royal Pine is far to fast to use and instead something closer to 10-mph is appropriate through the roundabout. A single lane roundabout is not designed to handle high traffic volume and with 3 funnels of traffic coming into it in this scenario, it quickly becomes overwhelmed. In an urgent evacuation, common traffic courtesy will be thrown out the window. It should be expected that a traffic accident will occur there and very likely will block that entire path out of the neighborhood. So the point of concern is not that it will take too long to get out of the neighborhood but instead that this path will cease to be a viable exit in an emergency. This is actually a concern for me without the multi-family development. Adding an additional 400 cars right next to the single point of exit greatly amplifies the risk and concern to an unacceptable level.

What I would like to see done is a proper modeling of an evacuation scenario - one based on the worst case conditions where evacuating through Old Ranch is blocked due to a fire coming from Black Forest. I believe the findings will be that the single lane roundabout on Royal Pine cannot handle this situation. The only remedy would be to redesign this intersection, likely into a 2-lane roundabout or install a traffic light.

Thank you
Dan Harfert

Hubble, Logan K

From: Eddie Lawrence <eddielawrence68@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 1:06 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartment Objection Letter
Attachments: Royal Pines Apartments Letter Eddie Lawrence.pdf

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. Hubble,

Please see my attached letter of objection to the Royal Pines Apartments development.

Thank you,

Edwin Lawrence

Hubble, Logan K

From: ROGER BAER <BAERRC@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 10:46 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: Posey, Steve; Helms, Randy
Subject: Royal Pine Apartment Objection

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!

Logan:

You have heard all the logic and objections (emergency evacuation, traffic, schools overcrowding, etc. etc.) from many current Pine Creek residents of why the Royal Pine Apartments are not a good fit for the Pine Creek Village area. I will simply repeat my dissatisfaction if the city were to approve this proposal by the developer. This is not my first letter to you but my final attempt to dissuade such a development.

Pine Creek Village and Cordera are two subdivisions in Colorado Springs whose residents take a high level of pride in their communities.

You may think I am trying to over-generalize or label the potential residents of a low-income housing development, but it is obvious that low-income housing residents do not take the same level of pride in their housing as homeowners because they do not own the property. We know that the property in question was rezoned by the city multi-use allowing residential properties without either Pine Creek residents or business owner input.

- But why would the city want to house people who have perhaps the lowest level of pride in their community (with the exception of homeless people) immediately next to a community in Colorado Springs that generally takes the highest level of pride in home ownership and the community? This makes no sense from a zoning point of view. The zoning classifications are too broad in definition.
- It is a well-known fact that crime increases in areas where there are low-income residents. Is the city prepared in the Briargate/Pine Creek area to staff for an increase in crime?
- And why would the city of Colorado Springs believe the promises of a developer from Oregon who has no real track record in Colorado Springs (their development on Academy is not fully operational yet) and ignore the objections of the Pine Creek and Cordera residents who DO HAVE a track record of being conscientious citizens and who have pride of ownership in their community.

We know the city has issues of affordable housing—we understand. But putting low-income housing immediately next to an upscale neighborhood like Pine Creek and Cordera is a mismatch and a non-sense. There are plenty of other properties in Colorado Springs that are a better match.

Thanks
Roger & Laurie Baer
Heartwood @ Pine Creek

Hubble, Logan K

From: Jim Blair <froggyamate@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 9:44 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments

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!

Logan,

The proposed apartments at Royal Pines are not compatible with current residential and business structures within at least a 5 mile radius.

Additionally, the apartments are not compatible with the current business oriented structures and activities currently located at the proposed site; as well as the original mutually agreed upon intent of the Briargate Master Plan which was designated as and for commercial uses.

Placement of a 4-5 story affordable housing apartment complex in predominantly residential neighborhood at this site is totally inappropriate.

Furthermore, additional factors to consider include:

- Building on an already environmentally sensitive area(s)
- Major increases in traffic in an already maxed out road (Royal Pines) and anticipated impact on major Evacuation Routes.
- Anticipated and a major negative impact on education quality and supportability at Pine Creek High School and neighborhood elementary schools.
- Increased crime rates as evidenced by the latest CSPD and El Paso County crime statistics for this area and extending to both north, south, east, and west of the Powers, Hwy 83, Interquest, Voyager, and Northgate Blvd corridor(s) transportation choke points. (Note: Additional impact on emergency evacuation as mentioned previously above)
- The extreme high cost of building the apartments that according to the Developer, DBG will end up in excess of \$ 70-75 million by the time the project is completed-or approximately \$325,000-&350,000 per apartment!
- Immediate reduction in property values for homes within a 1,000 ft to 1 mile radius of the complex.
- Lack of viable public transportation within 1-2 miles.

Please include my comments in all planning documents to include in any and all presentations to the Planning Commission, City Council, Mayor's Office, Colorado Springs and Pikes Peak Emergency Management Administrators; and applicable Colorado State and Federal agencies.

Thank you,
Jim

Sent from my iPhone

Hubble, Logan K

From: Brenda & Terry Winn <trbsw70@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 9:19 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: I would like to make a comment about the Royal Pinecreek apartments

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, my name is Brenda Winn and my husband is Terry Winn. We have lived in the Pinecreek area for nine years on Cherry Plum Drive. We are retired and this is the last home we will have. I want you to know that I was raised in public housing, (The Projects). During the 50s and 60s. The one thing that you should know is that those weren't like the public projects that they have nowadays. There was no violence or disrespect for the people or the buildings ..mostly really good people. But the areas for miles around their property values went down, really badly . People had difficulty selling if they were close to the projects. This new apartment complex will change the dynamics of a lot of things in our community. We will worry about our safety especially if we take walks after dark, which we do regularly. We have a really nice neighborhood and we feel safe but if you bring all those people in it will not be safe.

Sincerely,

Brenda and Terry Winn

719-661 0113

Hubble, Logan K

From: Colleen L <cplboiler@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 6:49 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments

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!

Logan,

I have concerns about the Royal Pines Apartments.

- 1) Although the developer has added several more parking spaces, there are not enough parking spots to guarantee parking for all vehicles for the apartment renters. More parking spaces cannot be provided due to space limits. The reasonable solution is to **reduce the number of apartments** in this plan; the concept is too dense for the size of the lot. The city should not accept a plan that falls short of providing adequate parking. Also, assistance for the businesses next to the apartments should be provided - no cars from the apartments should be parked during the day and overnight in the business lots.
- 2) Traffic from the apartments will flow through Pine Creek on Pine Manor. This is not acceptable for the safety of the neighborhood residents - Pine Manor has a steep incline that results in speeding. What plans are made to prevent this? Additional speed bumps and stop signs?
- 3) Due to the already busy streets surrounding the Pine Creek neighborhood, fire evacuation is an issue and concern. Pine Creek has open spaces that create wildfire risk. With Briargate Pkwy having dense traffic during peak times from Cordera, Wolf Ranch especially, and Union having traffic from Pine Creek but also from the many densely developed apartments off Union, the neighborhood will have trouble evacuating anyway. In a wildfire situation, it can be easily thought that Cordera, Gatehouse Village, and Wolf Ranch will also evacuate using Briargate Parkway. How will the neighborhood residents **already here** evacuate with the addition of the vehicles from the apartments?

Colleen Lester

Hubble, Logan K

From: Anna <anovy1@aol.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 11:38 PM
To: AN; Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments Question

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 Logan,

I think the city has now aquired the wildlife preserve land from the Federal wildlife.

The apartments will only be one lot away from the wildlife preserve, who will authorize the building of the apartments next to the wildlife preserve?

Since there is a good probability, there will be an incident between the apartment residents and any of the numerous wildlife that live there, will the city increase it's liability insurance coverage?

Does the city recognize that the wildlife was in that area first and they are being encroached upon by the high density of the apartment complex? Some of the animals may be really upset, what are the plans of the city to minimize the discomfort of the animals during the construction period and eventual occupancy?

Thank You,
Anna Novy

Sent from my iPhone

Hubble, Logan K

From: Randy Howarth <randy_howarth@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 10:16 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: Randy Howarth
Subject: COPN-23-0015 Neighbor Feedback - Updated Developer Plan Submittal

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 Logan Hubble and Planning Department,

As noted in previous correspondence regarding this proposed development, we are strongly opposed to the building of a 4-story complex and associated structures approximately 50 feet from our property and one story home in Pine Creek/Orchard Park.

IMPACT TO NEIGHBORS ABUTTING THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT -

The developer has stated that they will provide a landscape buffer to mitigate the view into our backyard but it is impossible for any landscape trees to be large enough to block the view of a 4 story building into our backyard. First - Trees are never planted at mature sizes and take many years to grow to substantial sizes. The landscape plan shows 50% would be evergreen and 50% deciduous which does little to block sightlines half of the year.

There is no indication of fencing or walls to be built along Royal Pine by the developer. A six foot wall similar to that in Pine Creek should be built to provide additional separation, if the development were allowed to be built.

Other major concerns:

SAFETY - We have had 2 major fires in the area since 2012, destroying hundreds of homes and resulting in the death of 4 people who could not escape in time and many others who barely escaped trying to flee their neighborhoods. (Waldo Canyon and Black Forest).

Last year, we went onsite and provided support for families near Boulder where the Marshall Fire destroyed 1084 structures and 2 people were killed, along with 8 seriously burned. The 115 mph winds blew the fires through suburban neighborhoods like ours and many barely escaped with their lives. Over 1000 pets were also killed.

Royal Pine and the proposed development have very limited access and exits available with all traffic exiting through a single lane roundabout shared with the inhabitants of Pine Creek. With over 300 cars expected with the proposed development, 1400+ homes in Pine Creek plus the 3 businesses already existing in the development area – there is no way that all can exit to Union Avenue in a timely manner.

If a fire happened in the area – whether in existing homes, wildlife habit area nearby or the new apartments and the wind conditions were right – there would be deaths of those trying to evacuate. Not to mention that if a single car were to stall in the single roadway, it would be a nightmare situation. The roads were not built with emergency exiting in mind.

In addition, with all the cars attempting to exit the area at the same time, emergency vehicles would have limited access to the area on a single lane roundabout, which is already difficult for a fire engine when no traffic is present.

LIGHTING AND NOISE – the developer has stated in updated comments that they will put in lower light poles to mitigate the impact of lights disturbing our home 50 feet away. It is not possible to have a parking lot and office that close without lights impacting our livability. A 4 story apartment complex will have lights on all night shining in our property plus the noise of 300 plus cars coming and going.

The statement that there will be many fewer trips than the previously approved concept plan from 2007 is a straw man argument. That concept plan never went forward and was not accepted by the community at that time. There was no need to appeal anything in that plan because it was terminated by the developer. Royal Pine west of Union is just not appropriate for this level of traffic – especially in an emergency situation.

PARKING – as mentioned previously – any parking spaces need to allow for maximum number of tenants of driving age plus their guests. They cannot expect to use spaces of the nearby 3 businesses and there is zero parking available on Royal Pine. Orchard Park has very limited parking space for the existing home today and no one from the apartments or their guests should be parking in that neighborhood.

Other neighbors have done a good job articulating other issues such as impact to wildlife, crime potential, lack of transportation resources, walkability, etc.

We agree with all of them, but have restated our most important concerns – especially impact on our livability and safety and so, once again, strongly oppose this development plan moving forward.

Best regards,

Randy and Sandra Howarth

4276 Apple Hill Ct.

Colorado Springs, CO 80920

(719) 602-3796

Hubble, Logan K

From: BILL <wj8965@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 4:34 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Pine Creek apartments

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. Hubble,

It appears the city doesn't care about this projected low income apartment project in Pine Creek. With only one way in, this propose a significant traffic safety concern for motoring public and pedestrians. It will cause an overflow of students in the local D20 schools that are already overflowing with students. Police and fire response is also a concern. It's just a bad idea. There are not a lot of retailers in the Pine Creek area offering jobs as the developer had said earlier in his bid to build this project.

Hubble, Logan K

From: Larry Borland <k12cop@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 3:51 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartment Project

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 afternoon, Logan. I have been keeping up with developments on the apartment project. Barbara and I still have a number of concerns.

While this has been partially addressed, we are unhappy that the zoning was effectively changed without notice from commercial to another designation to allow the apartment project.

- A four story apartment complex is not in keeping with the character of the neighborhood. **It will literally loom over the adjacent houses.**
- There will be significant traffic increased on a minor feeder street.
- We still do not believe adequate parking is available.
- There is a neighborhood park within 2-3 blocks of the project. It is a safe assumption that apartment dwellers will use this park, but it is maintained by the homeowners association. There is no indication that the developers will assist in maintenance.
- The initial claim by the developer that the project would serve low to moderate income people **like teachers, police officers and fire fighters.** I spent 20 years in law enforcement and 18 years in public education. These positions are well paid and these are *not* the people that would be renting apartments there.
- There are limited job opportunities in the area for low/moderate income individuals.
- We have seen no indication that social supports have been addressed for low income people. We do not want the City to build what will amount to "the projects."
- We have concerns about increased levels of crime.

Frankly, we think this project is going to proceed even over the objections of the neighborhood, but wanted to at least state our concerns. We appreciate you taking the time to hear us out.

Larry and Barb Borland

Hubble, Logan K

From: DAN BLOOM <zzbloom01@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 2:44 PM
To: Yemi Mobolade; All Council - DL; Hubble, Logan K; Posey, Steve; Helms, Randy; Armydad1972@yahoo.com
Cc: michael dziuba; Scott Lee
Subject: Affordable Housing Supplement

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 Mayor and All City Representatives'

Why hasn't anyone looked at NOT building additional affordable housing and instead supplement low income persons to live in the area of their choosing?

If you provided low income persons up to \$500.00 per month and used only \$2 million dollars per year this would help at least 333 individuals/families per year. This would not give them the stigma of living in affordable housing and allow them to live closer to where they work. This might be equity not putting people in one apartment complex that are considered low income. You have established criteria on what the cost of rent should be for low income renters and by paying the difference for the apartment they would be able to live in any type of apartment. In some cases, they may even be able apply this money toward renting an individual home.

In addition, talking to nurses, police, and fire personnel they would rather live in an apartment or home not in an area several minutes from where they work.

Hopefully, this is considered instead of having a 42 million dollar affordable housing project be built forcing people to live where they may not want to. This is not equity.

If you have any questions, please give me a call at 719.291.6541.

Sincerely,
Dan Bloom
Colorado Springs Resident

Hubble, Logan K

From: Cynthia Martinez <cpmartinez@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 1:16 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments
Attachments: Royal Pines Apartments

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!

Hubble, Logan K

From: Mark Woodman <mark.a.woodman@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 1:06 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine apartments concerns

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. Logan,

I'm a homeowner and resident in Pine Creek.

Arguably one of the least convenient things about this subdivision is getting in and out of it. The Royal Pine / Union intersection is our main access point. It's easily disrupted by a disabled vehicle or construction. Even somebody turning slowly to go to the vet or dentist can slows multiple cars behind them all the way back to the intersection.

I can think of no way to make that intersection worse than to add several hundred vehicles who are going to be exclusively using that intersection and roundabout. Putting apartments with hundreds of residents on that corner will create a traffic bottleneck that can't be reasonably relieved. I haven't heard that the city is willing to redesign the Powers/Union interchange to accommodate that kind of flow.

Please don't put apartments there. It won't be fair to the residents to trap them on a property with one viable access point, and it's not fair to everyone else who has to use that same exit.

Imagine adding 30% more bedrooms to your house, but they all share the same door, and it's the door to your garage.

Please don't allow this project to continue.

Regards,

Mark Woodman

Hubble, Logan K

From: alexlizchris <alexlizchris@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 12:32 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments
Attachments: Royal Pines Apartments

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!

Hubble, Logan K

From: Tracy Clay <clayfamily8@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 11:35 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments/Pine Creek

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. Hubble,

I am a resident of Pine Creek. I live at 9574 Pinebrook Way. I am very much AGAINST the building of these apartments. I do not understand why city planners think it's a good idea to build subsidized housing next to an existing middle to upper class neighborhood. It's an eyesore to see a multi-unit apartment complex at the entrance of our neighborhood. I am concerned about my property value decreasing, parking issues within the complex, auto congestion getting into and out of the neighborhood, the student overcrowding in our schools, and the overall negative aesthetic this will bring to our community. How about you build this complex next to your neighborhood or next to any of the city council or city planning department members' neighborhoods.

Don't build these apartments next to Pine Creek!!!!!! Please STOP this action!!

Sincerely,
Tracy Clay
Pine Creek resident

Hubble, Logan K

From: Randy Gross <randy.gross@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 11:34 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments

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 Logan,

I wanted to provide my comments on the Royal Pine apartments. Ultimately, what is the city prepared to do to mitigate any negative outcomes after the build where your theoretical predictions based on wide studies don't equal local reality? Some thoughts on those impacts below are echoed by others:

1. There is a glut of apartments [in the area](#) and nationwide. These apartments do not need to be built as there is more than enough capacity for the next 5 years. You know this already and are willfully disregarding national and local trends.
2. Property values in my neighborhood will almost certainly drop - the studies you cite actually confirm that the sprawl of this development and the reprehensible design will combine to do so. Crime will absolutely increase simply because loading younger families en masse in a cramped environment will lead to frustrated anxiety that will spill out into the community. Traffic will become worse - your study was done at the literal lowest time of the year. The stats your department uses for community impact are slanted and patronizing to try to dispel what are very likely outcomes. If you had a home directly across from the apartments, would you reasonably expect that value to increase in line with relatively sized properties a mile away? Of course not. Everyone expected medical buildings, and the city is inexplicable applying a maneuver that is ridiculous. This is a zero-sum game at best, and likely a negative sum as affordable apartments turn into blighted buildings developers will leave as quickly as possible, despite hollow promises to the contrary.
3. The design of these buildings is truly hideous - too block-like, too high relative to other dwellings (even with the new city law), and an eyesore for all who drive past Powers. They don't fit with Briargate, Pine Creek, or Cordera - if this is an attempt to destroy that master vision, well done.
3. Pine Creek is a unique community in terms of what we pay for grounds and landscaping and maintain as an HOA. The city will now trample on what we maintain by adding non-paying users to my neighborhood.'s environment. Our costs will increase. We have a private park we built and maintain - should we call you when others use something that isn't theirs?
4. It's clear you have an agenda to make this happen. I cannot figure out what the motivation here is that couldn't have been handled by embedding this vision into dozens of other apartment complexes. The over the top funding with bonds here that taxpayers aren't on the hook for seems to be something we're bound to all have to pay for somehow.

People need a place to live, and I support that. So please drop the density of this new community by 30%, lower the building size, and recognize that just because you can maximize every inch of space, it doesn't mean that you should. You can accomplish your goals in a more reasonable manner.

Thank you for reading.

Randy Gross

Hubble, Logan K

From: William Yun <yunjames2002@yahoo.co.kr>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 11:32 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apt

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. Hubble,

I hope this letter finds you well. I am writing to express my concerns and opposition to the proposal of constructing affordable housing in our affluent neighborhood. While I understand the importance of providing housing for those in need, I believe there are several reasons why this particular initiative may not be suitable for our community.

Firstly, our neighborhood has developed its character and desirability over the years due to the specific demographic it attracts. Introducing affordable housing may alter the socio-economic makeup and potentially disrupt the cohesion that currently exists. This could impact property values and the overall ambiance that residents have come to appreciate and enjoy.

Moreover, the addition of affordable housing may lead to an increase in population density, which can strain existing infrastructure and public services. Our neighborhood's amenities, such as schools, parks, and recreational facilities, may not be equipped to handle an influx of residents. This could result in overcrowding and a decline in the quality of services for both current and new residents.

Furthermore, the concerns regarding safety cannot be overlooked. While it is important to recognize that financial circumstances do not dictate an individual's behavior, the possibility of higher crime rates is a legitimate concern for many residents. Introducing affordable housing without adequate measures in place to ensure the safety and security of the community could lead to increased unease and a diminished sense of well-being among residents.

Instead of focusing solely on integrating affordable housing into our neighborhood, I propose exploring alternative solutions to address the issue of housing affordability. Collaborating with local organizations and authorities to identify suitable locations in areas that are better equipped to handle the associated challenges could be a more viable approach. This way, we can ensure that those in need are provided with adequate housing options while preserving the unique character and stability of our neighborhood.

I kindly request that you consider these concerns and explore alternative avenues to address the issue of affordable housing. By doing so, we can strike a balance between meeting the needs of the less fortunate and preserving the integrity and character of our beloved community.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

William Yun

Hubble, Logan K

From: The King's <outlook_484083F9BA5541F5@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 11:31 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Proposed Apartment Project

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 Logan – We live in the Palisade subdivision of the Pine Creek PUD.

Our family of 3 is still very opposed to the Royal Pine apartment project for several very good reasons.

1. Traffic up and down Royal Pine, Union, Blvd., and Briargate.. The round about, circle in front of the subject is very tight and too small for the 300 unit proposed project.
2. Property values for the Pine Creek area will drop, very likely significantly, due to the increased crime that low income housing always brings. I am sorry about this fact but it is a common sense fact.
3. The City evidently promised the adjacent medical businesses that the subject land would not be used for residential purposes. And if the City approves the apartment project the City will be going against a promise and the citizens will lose more trust in the City government. Trust in the Colorado Springs city government is already very low.

Please tell the Planning Commission and the City Council (especially the Mayor) to deny the subject project. The Pine Creek neighborhoods absolutely do not want this apartment project.

The Pine Creek neighborhoods need a park. The subject land is most suited for a park.

Sincerely, Bob and Joni King

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Hubble, Logan K

From: DEBORAH HARNEY <deb.hay@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 11:08 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: ROYAL PINES APARTMENT COMPLEX

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!

Transportation is a big issue for people in low-income housing, especially for GROCERIES. An ALTERNATIVE and better LOT for a low-income housing complex is sitting empty, is not far from the current proposal, and it is within easy walking distance of the Safeway at Union as well as the Briargate Medical Complex. It is immediately to the north of the Safeway and to the east of the Briargate Medical Complex and just to the west of Union Blvd. WHY IS THAT LOT NOT UNDER CONSIDERATION BY THE DEVELOPER -- or being proposed as a better location for prospective low-income residents by the city planners??

The CURRENT lot is NOT within EASY walking distance of a grocery store. And the added congestion from proposed apartments on the current lot is simply not prudent because it pours in more traffic congestion near Memorial North/UC Hospital and Children's Hospital. Realizing that IF SOMETHING would be built on the current site, most of us thought it would be additional medical/dental businesses since there is currently such a facility on that site and because of the location near to the hospitals. Why would the city approve of increased congestion near these hospitals?

Consider the impact of high-density housing on increased traffic and bottlenecks on hospital access -- not just for those in Pine Creek -- but for those on the east side of Powers and Black Forest and Flying Horse. High-density housing will have a much higher impact on hospital access than other building options for that lot. Clinics ideally, but If housing, perhaps condos or townhomes or something of lower density, but please do not significantly increase traffic near such a main artery as Union for people trying to get to hospitals -- let alone ambulances!!!

I hope you will represent this important issue and ask for reconsideration of the location to a better site for THE PROSPECTIVE RESIDENTS!!

Deborah Harney
3160 Blackwood Place
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

Hubble, Logan K

From: Ann Kumm <akummco1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 10:35 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments

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.. Hubble,

I am writing again to express my concerns and issues with the proposed Royal Pine Apartment complex. I continue to believe that the city and developer have not acted in good faith in proposing this site for this project.

Changing the zoning in back-room fashion so that Pine Creek residents as well as the professional business owners already there is in effect resulting in a "bait and switch" moment (and did you know the large sign advertising professional medical space is STILL on that property?). It's magical thinking to expect that homeowners who have lived here for 10-20 years are happy with such a change as it WILL affect the feel, security and financial investments of homeowners.

I have mentioned previously, but am doing so again. There are other nearby properties that offer more advantages if you absolutely feel this project needs to be built in northeastern Colorado Springs. The larger property on Cordera Crest Parkway was (and probably still is) zoned for apartments. It allows for easier and safer ingress/egress (probably even for two driveways onto the property). It would provide more space for a playground or pet area. An already established child play park and walking paths are right across the street. It is a quarter mile north of a licensed daycare facility. It is within walking distance of Pine Creek HS and close to the newest D20 Elementary school, Encompass Heights.

I feel that the City of Colorado Springs bears some blame for the supposed lack of affordable housing. We all know that COS, over the years, has approved almost every business/development deal that comes to them...regardless of resident input and disagreement. We have a new mayor largely because of that. I voted for him because I am one of those who felt this city needs to be smarter in its growth and development.

By letting any and every developer build large, fancy apartment complexes with expensive amenities, the city has not accounted for those who don't need/can't afford all the bells and whistles. The city can't have it both ways. Developers all along could have been told they need to create living spaces along a price continuum if they wanted to build in this city. To date, this city has just had a "live and let live" approach and now it is backfiring.

To continue, the issues and problems at the proposed Royal Pine site still remain:

The traffic study was not as robust or full as the developer told us it would be. I haven't heard that the City has pressed the issue on this either.

-The ingress/egress is woefully inadequate.

-Public transportation is not easily accessible at this location.

-There are no public schools within easy walking distance (I admit that Liberty HS kids could walk or ride a scooter but they have to cross two very busy rush-hour-traffic-laden roads to do so.)

-D20 public schools in the area are already at or above capacity, even with portable classrooms.

-The site is rather small for the developer to create much of a play area or pet relief area.

-Protection of the adjacent open space and the wildlife within has been largely left out of the discussion by the developer and the city. One of the great charms and assets of this city are the protected areas. This one is vibrant with mule deer, bobcats, coyotes,

hawks, elk and occasional eagles and bears. I fear that noise, trash, loose pets and even unsupervised minors will impact this negatively. A grass fire starting there or moving up there is also a very real concern.

-Pine Creek as a whole has a more natural scape than many of the newer developments: no waterfalls, just one fairly modest neighborhood park, no clubhouse or pool. Additionally, it has softer lighting so as to help protect the natural feel. The lights alone from the proposed development will be a shock to many in Pine Creek.

-Parking: will nearby homeowners have to live with apartment dwellers' vehicles parked in front of their homes due to inadequate parking? This will be a big point of contention for homeowners as it impacts their property's appeal AND safety (see auto thefts, etc).

-Public safety issues should not be taken lightly by City decision makers. Their heads are in the sand if they don't believe that a high density low-income property isn't going to bring car break-ins, car thefts, catalytic converter thefts and other associated criminal activities. It is a common occurrence on a daily basis in Springs apartment complexes.

THERE IS NOT ADEQUATE, TIMELY, EFFECTIVE POLICE PROTECTION IN THIS CITY AT THIS TIME! A fully fenced and gated access to the complex would help, but the developers have said "there isn't adequate room"...just one more admission from them that this is not a good property for their needs. At a minimum, a metal or stucco fence around all sides of the property should be a safety requirement to aid in keeping pets and children from wandering onto busy streets or the open space. It just makes sense!

I can only express how disappointed I am in this city's ongoing "build, build, build then ask questions later" philosophy. We live in such a beautiful area with so many wonderful features and qualities but the city seems hell-bent on building on every available square inch with no regard to residents' concerns and neighborhood integrity. The water tower issue on the west side doesn't help me trust any city entity or department. I already have one neighbor that has moved because of the pending Royal Pines complex and there are several others in my 48-home area of Pine Creek that have stated they will leave too. Such a shame!

Please scrutinize the details while making this decision. Is this city listening at all?

Ann Kumm

3714 Palazzo Grove

Colorado Springs, CO 80920

Hubble, Logan K

From: James Krueger <herrmankrug@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 10:30 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments

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 for the 1st time about the planned construction of the Royal Pines Apartments. I strongly object to the need for these apartments at the proposed location for several reasons.

1. The low-income occupants: Where will the low-income occupants work? Is there city transportation (ie buses) that will serve the area and the occupants?
2. Traffic: the area is simply not constructed for the increase in auto traffic. Roads will not be adequate to accommodate the increased traffic. Will there be enough parking spaces within the compound for the occupants to park their autos?
3. Harmony: the area is an area where families live in homes - not apartments. The surrounding families clearly do not want a large apartment complex in their backyard. Homebuyers bought in an area with single-family homes. Ask yourself - wouldn't you protest these apartments if you lived in the area?
4. Crime: facts can show that there will be an increase in crime. Supporting crime data will show more crime happens in areas within and surrounding apartment complexes.

Thank you for reading my concerns.

James B Krueger
2926 Blackwood Pl
Colorado Springs CO 80920
719-232-4023

Hubble, Logan K

From: Ashley Boyle <atboyle1@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 10:29 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments

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,

As a Pine Creek resident for the past 10 years, I would like to formally submit my opposition to the planned Royal Pines apartments. I object to the construction of these apartments for numerous reasons including lack of infrastructure including roads, parks, shopping centers etc, lack of capacity at local schools especially at Pine Creek High School and potential noise and traffic concerns.

Despite what paid consultants and developers who have no knowledge of or stake in District 20 and our neighborhood may say, as a parent of children attending these schools and a resident of the actual neighborhood in question, I know that all of my concerns are valid.

Thank you for your time.

Ashley Boyle
9571 Stoneglen Drive

Hubble, Logan K

From: Steve Darnall <steve.darnall@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 10:23 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments

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!

Logan,

I am a resident in Pine Creek off of Royal Pine and Heartwood, so very close to the proposed development. I have a lot of concerns with this development, but mainly mixing low income into our neighborhood as well as traffic safety congestion. I've worked hard my entire life to not live in a lower income area. I have put a lot of time and money into my home and had planned to keep it forever, but if this goes through, I will be looking to live elsewhere. I work in the multi-family industry in flooring and am in apartment complexes throughout this town on a daily basis. I see what goes on in the likes of Copper Creek, Summit Creek, Sedona Ridge, and many of those in lower income neighborhoods in the SE part of town. I am also a part of the apartment association and am very involved in issues facing the apartment community. Low-income housing is needed, but there are more suitable areas that have better opportunities for those that need public transportation, access by walking, etc... I'm not sure where you live or your circumstances, but I'm willing to bet you or the investors would not want this put in your backyard after working so hard to have something nice.

I sincerely hope you will reconsider approving this project.

Best Regards,
Steve Darnall
719-963-0010

Hubble, Logan K

From: sarah arnold <sarahhaberarnold@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 10:21 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Community Concerns Royal Pine Apartments

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 Logan Hubble,

I wanted to continue to voice concerns regarding the construction of the Royal Pine Apartment Complex. My biggest concern is the impact this will have on already overcrowded schools. Pine Creek High School is at max capacity and no longer choice-ing in any additional students. I don't see how adding additional neighborhood students would help this situation. The school currently has no cafeteria for students as well, and options for school lunch are limited.

Traffic is another major concern. Adding a four story complex in a tight area cornered up against a wildlife habitat makes this not a wise location. There are plenty of open property in other areas of Colorado Springs even close by that would make a better location with improved walkability and better access to bus routes. Traffic along Pine Manor would be the biggest concern for neighborhood residents. This street runs along our neighborhood park and school bus route which also includes a blind hill. This area should be considered in the traffic study that should be done by a third party. Any traffic study done by the developer doesn't seem fair. Residents would be using this street through our neighborhood to head west rather than fighting the lights on Union. Additional stop signs near blind hill would need to be installed to ensure safety near our neighborhood park where kids cross this street often. A round about being the only exit for the complex is a concern for safety in evacuation.

It's unfortunate that community developers are pushing to put in high rises along wildlife habitats which destroys the beauty of a neighborhood that many have invested in. There are other locations that would benefit more greatly where local businesses are nearby with walkability and wouldn't disturb the wildlife and beauty of our community. An area where shopping and complexes are nearby already in which apartments are a good fit.

We appreciate the help in expressing these concerns to developers and community leaders to better understand the concerns of our neighbors.

Regards,
Sarah Arnold

Sent from my iPhone

Hubble, Logan K

From: Fernando de la Cuadra <fernando_dlc@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 10, 2023 10:15 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments

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, Mr. Hubble,

I want to echo my fellow neighbors' concern regarding the development of this apartment complex on the corner of Royal Pine and Union. While there are many aspects of this development that are worrisome, by far, the most egregious is the effect that this collection of people in this strategic exit point from the neighborhood will have on any emergency evacuations that happen in Pine Creek.

If there was some way to create alternative exit routes from the apartment complex, we may be able to avert the loss of life that might otherwise occur if a wildfire is forcing residents out to the south. Living on the north east corner of the neighborhood, I only have two exit routes in case of an impending fire. If the fire is coming from the west or north, escaping out Chapel Hills to old Ranch may very well not be feasible. The thought that I may be stuck with my disabled wife in a long line of cars going south on Royal Pine towards Union, where the congestion at that corner becomes so thick that there is no movement, terrifies me. There are literally few alternative routes that I could escape a fire from the west or north from. I beg you to work with the developers and city planning to once again review the impact this apartment complex will have on the safety of the residents of Pine Creek.

Respectfully,

Fernando de la Cuadra
3224 Silver Pine Trl, 80920

Hubble, Logan K

From: Stevo Parrish <armydad1972@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 9, 2023 7:51 PM
To: Yemi Mobolade; Helms, Randy; breeanna.jent@gazette.com; mary.shinn@gazette.com; akieth@kktv.com; chelsea.brentzel@krdo.com; s.harrison@krdo.com; andy.koen@koaa.com; maggie.bryan@koaa.com; Asack@kxrm.com; news@cpr.org; news@krdo.com; news@fox21news.com; news@koaa.com; talkshow@aol.com; westsidewatchcos@gmail.com; allcouncil@coloradopsrings.gov; Hubble, Logan K; R. Marshall; Wintz, Katelynn A; PineCreek VillageNeighbors; Integrity Matters
Subject: Objection to COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141 (Royal Pines Apartments)

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!

Mayor Mobolade, City Council, and City Planners,

I am a long-term resident of Colorado Springs and a concerned taxpayer. I continue to object to the development of a 232-unit, multi-family apartment complex on the corner of Royal Pine Drive and Union BLVD for the following reasons.

- **Safety.**

The location of this complex requires all vehicles to utilize a single lane roundabout to exit the site. This roundabout is already shared by five businesses, their patrons, and 1,424 single-family houses within the surrounding Pine Creek Village, as well as delivery drivers and visitors. In the event of a **fire emergency**, as occurred in Boulder, CO (Marshall Fire),^[i] this single egress point will quickly become a traffic chokepoint, greatly increasing the potential for loss of life.^[ii] FLEET modeling shows that in the event of a fire evacuation, traffic will quickly congest at this roundabout and greatly increase the chance for loss of life.

I ask that the City Emergency Managers and Fire Chief either acknowledge this concern or sign their name to the Development Plan and state that they do not see a concern. DO NOT let them fail to do their due diligence on this item.

This concentration of traffic at one exit point raises serious apprehensions about **emergency vehicular access** for both the residents of the multi-family housing complex and the existing community. In the event of an emergency, such as a fire, the current traffic conditions will hinder the prompt arrival of first responders, especially for the very large ladder trucks^[iii] the apartments will require. This poses a significant risk to the safety and well-being of all residents in the vicinity.

- **Traffic.**

There was NO traffic study conducted for this development and the "estimates" the developer provided assume that each of the 1,424 existing residents would only leave their houses once per day and it was done during the summer, when school is not in session, and many are on

vacation. Daily routines often involve multiple trips for various activities such as work, school, errands, and social engagements. Consequently, the projected traffic volume according to the developer estimates does not accurately reflect the actual impact that this multi-family apartment complex will have on the surrounding roadways. A *traffic study* conducted by concerned citizens during AUG/SEP 2023 showed that the daily *trip count during a time of construction and road blockages equaled roughly 6,000 vehicles/day. This does not include pedestrian or bicycle traffic.* This developer states that the addition of 632 new people to the area will reduce traffic counts – this is impossible.

- **Inconvenience.**

Having a large apartment complex adjacent to existing office buildings and Pine Creek Village will be a **great inconvenience.** *Traffic* in the area will nearly double and create significant *delays and congestion*^[v] at the single-lane roundabout. In addition, the additional traffic through the neighborhood as new residents travel on Pine Manor Drive to reach Briargate BLVD will create additional noise, light, and air pollution and place animals from the Wildlife Habitat Area crossing the road at *increased risk* of death or severe injury. School buses will have to navigate through increased delays and accommodate more students, in an already overcrowded, under-staffed school district, specifically to the schools these residents will use.^[v] Using overall district numbers is folly and does not account for the schools that are less populated and far away. Pine Creek HS is using modular classrooms because they cannot handle the population of students within the existing buildings.

The new residents will not be in a good walking area, as the closest shopping location is a 15-minute walk across six lanes of heavy traffic. The single city bus line (38)^[vi] in the area has a stop almost ½ mile away, and only runs on Union BLVD, whereby riders must transfer to other buses to reach any destination, taking significant time.

The great height of these apartments (50+ feet) will create privacy issues for the medical offices and residences adjacent to it.^[vii] The developer states he will plant vegetation to block the apartments, yet no vegetation will block 3- and 4-story buildings or prevent their residents from being able to look directly into doctor's offices while they care for patients or into the backyards of those near these buildings. Even with directional lighting, the light pollution from these tall buildings will create a nuisance to those living nearby and impact the nocturnal wildlife that depend on darkness for their survival.^[viii], ^[ix] Inadequate parking for this development will mean that apartment residents will take up spaces at the five businesses and along Purple Plum Drive.

- **Environment.**

It is not in the public's interest to have high-density housing near the *Wildlife Habitat Area*, as it will negatively impact the animals this area was built to protect. The *protection of endangered and threatened species*^[x] is in the public interest for current and future generations. Animals often seen in the area are the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse, Lynx, Fox, Deer, Elk, Black Bear, Mountain Lion, Bobcat, Hawk, Bald Eagle, Golden Eagle, Peregrine Falcon, rattlesnake, and Garter Snake. I have personally seen several of these animals over the past year

and many have been caught on security cameras amongst our homes. There are also several imperiled and vulnerable plant species that deserve continued protection.^[xi]

- **Urban Sprawl.**

The development will **negatively impact the health** of the apartment residents and adjacent residents, but also the endangered species residing in the Wildlife Habitat Area close by. The National Institutes of Health and others have documented the negative effects of urban sprawl on people and the environment.^[xii] These include higher rates of chronic illnesses, increased pollution, and degraded habitats. Because this location has a **very poor walkability score**,^[xiii] these residents will have to drive to reach their destinations, thereby increasing noise, light, air, and chemical pollution, reducing exercise, and straining species already struggling for survival in a city being overbuilt. With only one bus stop nearly 1/2 mile away, residents of these apartments will likely drive, creating more traffic congestion and more pollution.

- **Expectations & Compatibility.**

This proposed development does not support the Briargate Plan or resident expectations when purchasing their properties. The residents of Pine Creek Village were told this land was for commercial uses (PBC- planned business complex), supported by a large sign on the property that reads, “Coming Soon, 45,000 ft square Medical Office Building.”^[xiv]

Ms. Katelyn Wintz acknowledged on Fox 21 that she could see how residents believed this property would be for commercial uses only. In addition, under the previous zoning, multi-family housing was "conditional." I ask, what conditions have changed to allow for so many apartments in such a small space and why doesn't the developer have to comply with the same restrictions Pine Creek residents and businesses have had to comply with for over 20 years? This applies to size, height, design, and color. The proposed development is well outside of this scope of design, implemented by La Plata as part of the Briargate Master Plan.

The proposed design of the development is outside of the scope of what is considered acceptable in Pine Creek, especially considering the businesses and homeowners are beholden to specific styles and colors.^[xv] The height of the planned buildings is twice what is currently in Pine Creek. Oversized buildings will be unsightly. Pine Creek Village pays HOA fees to maintain all common areas, dog waste stations, a private park, and the medians throughout the neighborhood and on Briargate BLVD. If the city wants to force Pine Creek Village to accept additional residents and the burden it will place on the common areas, the city of Colorado Springs should take responsibility for those areas and maintain them without the funds of the Pine Creek Village residents. The hard-working and diverse group of taxpayers of Pine Creek should not have to carry the financial burden of an unplanned development.

Many purchased their homes to get away from the pollution and traffic associated with other parts of the city that have incorporated high-density housing.

- **Questionable Use of Private Activity Bonds.**

The city of Colorado Springs voted on its intention to issue \$40M in private activity bonds (taxpayer-funded) to a single, out-of-state developer.^[xvi] Mr. Posey's brief on this development in May 2023 to City Council showed previous PAB fund issuances ranged between \$12M-\$14M and were balanced against multiple projects. However, this development will deplete all of 2023 and the remaining 2022 funds. The cost of the land (\$7.36M for 7.87 acres) is ludicrous and doesn't compare to any other development in the City, yet the land cost is more than 1/6 of the \$40M requested. The \$40M currently identified for one project should be distributed fairly amongst multiple developments and communities. A fair and transparent distribution of funds is the best course of action, especially for those that are seeking to revitalize older areas or provide residences for seniors (a population expected to triple by 2040 according to HomeCOS).^[xvii]

With 5,000+ available apartments^[xviii] and 12,000 actively under construction,^[xix] it seems unreasonable and questionable that the city of Colorado Springs would provide all its PAB funds to one developer.

Based on these concerns, and many others not addressed here, I implore you to deny this development. In addition, I call on the Mayor and our city officials to do the right thing and to pause development until the city can create a viable plan for sustainability. We also need more transparency with city processes and smart growth. You promised this at your "listening sessions" but you need to implement this now. No more waiting. No more developers making decisions for our City. **DO THE RIGHT THING!**

Make City Departments comment on their portion for every development, especially where there is significant resident concern. The residents of Colorado Springs pay their salaries and we DEMAND they do their due diligence.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

V/r
Stephen M. Parrish Sr.
4236 Apple Hill Ct
Colorado Springs, CO 80920
719-464-4220

^[i] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marshall_Fire

^[ii] [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Camp_Fire_\(2018\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Camp_Fire_(2018))

^[iii] <https://imgur.com/a/kquRNDv>

^[iv] https://ops.fhwa.dot.gov/congestion_report/chapter2.htm

^[v] <https://krdo.com/news/2020/01/07/population-growth-in-colorado-springs-leads-to-overcrowding-at-district-20-schools/>

^[vi] https://coloradosprings.gov/system/files/2023-04/rt38_montebellodr_spring_2023_final.pdf

^[vii] <https://mrsc.org/stay-informed/mrsc-insight/archives/protecting-existing-neighborhoods-from-the-impacts>

^[viii] <https://darksky.org/resources/what-is-light-pollution/effects/wildlife-ecosystems/>

^[ix] <https://www.denverpost.com/2021/05/29/dark-sky-towns-colorado-light-pollution-environment/>

^[x] <https://cpw.state.co.us/learn/pages/soc-threatenedendangeredlist.aspx>


- ^[xi] <https://cpw.state.co.us/aboutus/Pages/CNAP-Rare-Plants.aspx>
- ^[xii] <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1497432/pdf/12432132.pdf>; <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1253792/>
- ^[xiii] <https://www.walkscore.com/score/4180-royal-pine-dr-colorado-springs-co-80920>
- ^[xiv] <https://zallcompany.com/property/market-at-pine-creek>
- ^[xv] <https://safe.menlosecurity.com/doc/docview/viewer/docN0A875995D9156dff9288440d1e819019da74b8d52cbb79c4e1af5ad477ce7ff294bfc57ae661> pg 3.
- ^[xvi] https://gazette.com/news/government/colorado-springs-plans-to-issue-40-million-in-bonds-for-over-200-new-affordable-rental/article_914e60e4-f8cf-11ed-8f1d-3b410225cb11.html
- ^[xvii] <https://coloradosprings.gov/document/homecosplanobjectivespages23-42.pdf> pg 36.
- ^[xviii] <https://www.apartments.com/colorado-springs-co/>
- ^[xix] [Colorado Springs apartment market likely to be overbuilt](#)



Colorado Springs apartment market likely to be overbuilt

Amanda Miller Luciano

More than 1,600 new apartments became available in Colorado Springs during the first quarter of 2023. That's a r...



Colorado Springs apartment market likely to be overbuilt

Amanda Miller Luciano

More than 1,600 new apartments became available in Colorado Springs during the first quarter of 2023. That's a r...

Hubble, Logan K

From: Valerie Cooper <bvcoop@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, October 5, 2023 9:20 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: Brad Cooper
Subject: Royal Pine apartment complex

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!

We have reviewed the latest “updated” submittal of the proposed apartments off Royal Pine Dr. It doesn’t seem the developer has done anything to change the major concerns over the whole project for the people they assume will live there nor for the current population of our neighborhood and city (traffic, wildlife, safety, emergencies, schools, etc). The traffic study the city helped them with was once again over a holiday weekend—no valid info can be collected over holidays. I hope the city is still taking into consideration the myriad lists of concerns we as members of the city and this neighborhood have. We know you have a plethora of those lists and details and do not need to be repeated again.

Thank you for your time,
Brad & Valerie Cooper
719-337-3351
Pine Creek Village residents

Hubble, Logan K

From: Patty Bonsera <patty@pattybonsera.com>
Sent: Monday, August 21, 2023 1:02 PM
To: All Council - DL; Helms, Randy; Hubble, Logan K; Posey, Steve
Subject: Subject: Objection to COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141

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 Logan Hubble, Randy Helms, Steve Posey, and all of Colorado Springs City Council:

My name is Patty Bonsera. I've been a resident of Colorado Springs since 2014. I am a certified Business Continuity Manager, Disaster Preparedness Educator, and El Paso County/FEMA CERT volunteer. I've been involved in disaster preparedness planning since shortly after 9/11/01.

To clarify, I do not live in the Pine Creek neighborhood and I am not a homeowner. I do live in the Vue 21 apartment complex close by. So, why am I sending this to you and why am I deeply troubled by the proposed apartment complex near the Pine Creek community?

Very simply, as a concerned taxpayer and disaster preparedness educator living near the proposed project site, I object to the development of another multi-family apartment complex containing 232 units at the corner of Royal Pine Drive and Union Blvd. for the following reasons:

- **Safety concerns:**

There are already evacuation concerns with the existing infrastructure and lack of multiple egresses for residents of the Pine Creek community to use.

A single-lane roundabout is the only egress point for the development, posing potential risks during emergencies and hindering the prompt arrival of first responders, who are already understaffed.

- **Strained Emergency Resources and Blocked Evacuation Routes:**

The proposed high-density property near the Black Forest region will negatively impact emergency resources during a disaster like a wildfire, as it is along a major evacuation route and would burden emergency services already spread thin.

The two apartment complexes (Vue 21 and Aliso), directly on the other side of Powers Blvd. and Union Blvd., are high-density communities and absolutely must be considered in the event of an evacuation.

Vue 21 has 479 apartment units, housing upwards of 1,000+ residents. Aliso Briargate Apartments, directly between Super Target and Vue 21 have 244 units, housing 500+ residents. Building this new community near Pine Creek would be almost the equivalent of building another Aliso complex.

This does not even include the hundreds of residents in the single-family homes on this side of Powers and Union, in Cordera, that will also be impacted by the need to evacuate in the event of a wildfire. This does not include the Super Target, Lowes, and the surrounding businesses. All that I mentioned would need to access this one single intersection of Powers Blvd. and Union in order to access Powers Blvd.

There would be a bottleneck at the corner of Powers and Union like we've never seen before as the only major route to leave is on Powers Blvd. given that Union Blvd. in the other direction turns into a country road heading into Black Forest.

The bottleneck of traffic was one of the major challenges for those trying to escape the recent wildfire in Maui resulting in hundreds of people fleeing toward the ocean or being trapped in their cars.

While this is not Hawaii, it's not a matter of "if" another major wildfire will happen in Colorado Springs. It's a matter of when and where. As we saw in the summer of 2022, the fires are not only in the mountains anymore. The Farm, The Alturas Fire, and the Akerman Fire are just three of the urban wildfires experienced in 2022.

Thankfully, we've seen a lot of rain this year to mitigate the risk, but we can not become complacent as this year is the exception and not the norm. As of this writing, (August 20) we are again in red flag status.

I absolutely understand the need for additional affordable housing as every family is a working family.

At the same time, Colorado Springs can not continue to build in this way without making infrastructure changes and including disaster preparedness as part of the process. Have we not learned anything from Waldo Canyon, Black Forest, or the Marshall Fire?

I strongly encourage you and the team of developers to take all of what I've mentioned into account regarding the lack of infrastructure in this area which can not support a mass evacuation.

I request that the proposed project be DENIED, and reconsider future development plans within Colorado Springs to account for the voice of the community and smart city planning.


I look forward to hearing from you and discussing this further.

Yours sincerely,

Patty Bonsera, CBCI
Business Continuity Manager
Disaster Preparedness Educator
FEMA CERT Volunteer

719-347-5025

www.PattyBonsera.com



Patty Bonsera, CBCI
Business Continuity Manager &
Disaster Preparedness Educator
[How to reach out](#)

Founder | CEO, Patty Bonsera Consulting
[Continuity Planning Made Simple Free Guide](#)

Hubble, Logan K

From: Carolyn Hawley <carolynhawley@comcast.net>
Sent: Thursday, August 17, 2023 7:38 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Pine Creek Apartments

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 Hubble,

What are you all doing to our beautiful city! There is no thought going into your plans! Apartments are being slapped up all over the city! Our beautiful neighborhoods and green spaces are being compromised! Please reconsider the Pine Creek Apartments and the affect on businesses, schools, wildlife, and possibility of fires! Can you imagine an inferno with 300 plus cars and one way in & one way out! There would be no access for the 🔥 fire department!

Maj General & Mrs John W. Hawley

Sent from my iPhone

Hubble, Logan K

From: Omar Wyman <omarwyman@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 8, 2023 11:02 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: Wintz, Katelynn A; PineCreek VillageNeighbors; integritymatterscos@gmail.com; Dana Duggan
Subject: Lack of Accountability to Developer Responses for COPN-23-0015

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!

Logan:

What is the accountability process to make sure that ALL citizen questions are answered? Who deems that this is an "acceptable" response?

You have claimed in multiple emails sent to individuals and the community that ALL citizen-submitted questions and concerns were going to be responded to by the developer. Yet, how does 453 pages of citizen submitted questions/comments before the initial comment due date only warrant a 5 page response from the developer? How do we, as citizens, know that ALL citizen questions in those 453 pages are actually answered?

The developer does not indicate what questions were consolidated, answered, or are maybe irrelevant, yet you, as the community representative have accepted the developer response as "reasonable" answer to 453 pages of comments. So, as we patiently await the developer's response to the additional 158 pages of citizen comments submitted before the Aug 2nd deadline, how can we trust that you ensure that ALL citizen comments are answered?

I just briefly looked through the citizen concerns submitted on June 29th, 2023 that pertain to the developer's initial response and found this on page 1. From the document named "Citizen Comments from Attachments":

- How will the "tenants" be vetted and allowed to live in these units? Sex offenders, Violent criminals, felons, drug addicts/dealers are character concerns that I have witnessed living in a rent-controlled environment.
- Our home is under an HOA – we must abide by the standards and are held accountable for keeping our area nice. Even more so we are held accountable by our neighbors' expectations. How will the apartment renters be held accountable? (They won't be)

These are legitimate questions that we expect you to require the developer to answer, even if the answer is "not applicable." How are we supposed to trust in this process, when you don't hold the developer accountable to even acknowledge that a question was asked? I am not a city employee, and can only advocate for my neighbors during my free time, yet you are a full time employee and cannot do the due diligence to ensure all citizen questions are answered?

Additionally, all of the developer responses do not contain any evidence to back up their claims nor references to any documentation that we have access through your portal. For example, on page 2 of the developer response:

Property values

There is no empirical evidence to suggest that this type of housing will negatively impact home values in Colorado Springs, as corroborated by analysis conducted by Community Development. DBG Properties has also studied home values in neighborhoods where it has developed, and there is no correlation to impact on home values. This data was split further to specific neighborhoods in higher income areas, and no correlation was found.

A quick google search on this topic finds that it's contentious. Here is a literature review from the Journal of Planning Literature (<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0885412205277069>) that looked at 17 other research articles on the impact of affordable housing and shows it's very location-dependent.

So I would expect you, Logan Hubble, to ask the hard question and require the developer to provide evidence to support their claims such as links to this claimed analysis done by Community Development or DBG's assessments. As said above, the impact of affordable housing is highly dependent on location, so where is the evidence that affordable housing will not impact property values here in our neighborhood? Not some neighborhood in Oregon, or New Mexico, but here in my home, Colorado Springs. Again here, I am doing this in my free time and expect you to be holding developers accountable to "acceptable" responses. My observations thus far indicate due diligence is not being done which is the opinion of many in the neighborhood as well. We would not have these comments and concerns if we had trust in the city to hold developers responsible.

To reiterate, what policy do you hold yourself to make sure that the developer responses for these citizen comments are "acceptable"?

Please ensure that this makes it to the citizen comments submissions for this development.

I look forward to your timely response.

Thanks,

Omar

Hubble, Logan K

From: Sandy Garlie <melsangar@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 7, 2023 10:26 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: Governorpolis@state.co.us
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments

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. Hubble,

I've recently been told that the developers for this project have purposely kept the number of parking places low. The reason being they can then charge their renters \$200 per month for a parking space. This will surely be an extra cost "low cost housing residents" may not be able to afford and will result in many vehicles being parked on city streets. The 232 units being proposed could result in 500 or more vehicles. We already have many vehicles parked on our streets. This can only cause more congestion and safety issues, plus disgruntled homeowners who would not have parking space in front of their homes for visitors.

Please, please, rethink this developers greed and STOP them from building large apartment complexes, plus a "club house" in this small 8-acre area. Neighbors are very concerned about the safety issues among other things; traffic, utilities specifically water, and especially the safety of the children, and the protected wildlife area which you can almost be sure that all these children will be going into because they have nowhere else to play.

My husband and I are homeowners in the first block west of the traffic circle that will have the only access to this development on the east side of the traffic circle. It is a one-lane traffic circle that with the entire intersection including sidewalk handicap ramps was re-vamped in the last few months. If the intent is to re-do it again - who is going to pay for this - us taxpayers? Why should we have to pay for it again? That is a waste of taxpayer money?

Only one of your constituents,
Sandra Garlie
4212 Purple Plum Way
Colorado Springs, CO

I find there is no email available for mayor Yemi Mobolade, Why?

Hubble, Logan K

From: Stevo Parrish <armydad1972@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, August 7, 2023 8:53 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K; Friedman, Samuel; PineCreek VillageNeighbors
Subject: DEPN-23-0141
Attachments: The Market at Pine Creek Proposed Development Project - Comments.pdf

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!

Logan,

Attached is a document from 2006. I have highlighted key terms/parts. It was agreed that Lots 4-6 would not exceed 38 feet. I believe one of the buildings is on Lot 4. In addition, there are several mentions of this space being for commercial uses, hence the expectation of residents this was to be commercial. Lastly, note the highlight that the development had to complement the surrounding area. The proposed apartments do not complement the neighborhood in any way.

I am still trying to find the traffic impact study which showed an excess of 8,441 trips.

I think the biggest take away from this, is that the City included residents in the process from start to finish. I am unsure what has changed in COS codes/procedures but current processes don't seem to want or encourage citizen input.

When is the city meeting to discuss/approve-disapprove this development and can citizens attend to offer comments/concerns?

V/r
Steve Parrish

Preserve Pine Creek Village, LLC

Hubble, Logan K

From: Debbie Rose <debbiesrose68@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, August 7, 2023 8:28 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K; Helms, Randy; Posey, Steve
Cc: All Council - DL
Subject: Objection to Apartments at Pine Creek Royal Pine and union.

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 Logan Hubble:

As a concerned taxpayer living near the proposed project site, I object to the development of multi-family apartment complex containing 232 units at the corner of Royal Pine Drive and Union BLVD for the following reasons:

- **Safety & increased traffic concerns:** A single lane roundabout is the only egress point for the development, posing potential risks during emergencies and hindering prompt arrival of first responders.
- **Strained Emergency Resources and Blocked Evacuation Routes:** The proposed high-density property near the Black Forest region could negatively impact emergency resources during a disaster like a wildfire, as it is along a major evacuation route and would burden emergency services already spread thin. Residents' concerns about inequality in emergency services are not addressed in the project plans.
- **Incorrect traffic study assumptions:** The project anticipates adding 2,257 vehicle trips per weekday, with most of the traffic flowing onto Union Boulevard, known for significant backups and high accident rates. The submitted traffic study was not conducted during the school year and does not accurately measure impact to already strained infrastructure.
- **Lack of accessible transportation:** The proposed development's location has a low walkability score (26/100), limited public transportation options (only one bus line with a distant stop), and reduced travel convenience due to the single-lane roundabout.
- **Strained Education Resources for District 20 Students:** The development overlooks the consequences on an already struggling school district with over- enrollment, teacher shortages, and financial challenges.
- **Overlooked Taxpayer Financial Burdens:** The City approved the intent to issue a \$40 million bond for this development, but rising interest rates may cause unexpected losses and residents should be worried about undisclosed taxpayer costs for additional services related to the project.
- **Negative environmental impacts:** The development may endanger and harm a Wildlife Habitat Area. The National Institutes of Health have documented the negative effects of urban sprawl and increased pollution people and the environment.
- **Strained Community Infrastructure:** The development plan fails to address the additional strain on municipal services resulting from the conversion to high-density residential use. It also lacks details on compensating the community for increased burdens on schools and emergency resources. Moreover, there is no consideration for redesigning traffic flow to alleviate the existing stress on roads and patterns.
- **Counterproductive urban sprawl:** Adding over 630 residents in less than 8 acres will strain existing infrastructure, designed for commercial use in the 1980s, creating potential disasters and financial burdens for taxpayers, while the developer's lack of local interest raises concerns about smart growth and sustainability for Colorado Springs.
- **Impact to Surrounding Land Uses:** The development does not consider the impact on surrounding uses, particularly by the United States Air Force Academy (USFAA).

I request that the proposed project be DENIED, and reconsider future development plans within Colorado Springs to account for the voice of the community and smart city planning.

I look forward to your prompt response.

Thank you,
Debbie Rose

Current resident of Cordera and former resident of Pine Creek

Hubble, Logan K

From: DAN BLOOM <zzbloom01@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 6, 2023 5:09 PM
To: Yemi Mobolade; All Council - DL; Hubble, Logan K; Posey, Steve
Cc: krdoNews@krdo.com; 13investigates@krdo.com
Subject: ROYAL PINE APARTMENTS DEVELOPMENT 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 Mayor Mobolade, City Council, Mr. Posey and Mr. Hubble

I am sure none of you are familiar with how the Pine Creek Village Association (PCVA) was established. In 1992 La Plata proposed to build the PCVA neighborhood with 1424 homes and an apartment complex (Sage Brook) and amenities such as a gas station, restaurants and other businesses on the south end of the Pine Creek neighborhood. This proposal was approved by the city that PCVA would maintain all city owned common areas surrounding our community by HOA fees without any city maintenance. The city agreed to this proposal. PCVA pays for all irrigation, maintaining all landscaping, replacing damaged city sidewalks, snow removal on sidewalks, etc. This includes all of the property along the south side of Briargate Pkwy from Chapel Hills Drive to Union Blvd as well as the center median. The west side of Union Blvd from Royal Pine Drive to Briargate Pkwy. The street Pine Manor Drive from Royal Pine Dr. to Briargate Pkwy. and Chapel Hills Dr. from Old Ranch road to Briargate Pkwy. This year PCVA has budgeted approximately \$1.1 million dollars to maintain all these normal city responsibilities. We assess the apartment complex \$65K per year, the commercial businesses \$45K per year and homeowners \$1.7 million per year. At this time our total budget is \$1.8 million per year which includes administrative expenses.

I asked the question at the city meeting at the Chapel Hills Library on August 3rd if they were aware of the original agreement between the city and PCVA, none of the city representatives was aware of this and said they would get back to us. I can understand why they were not aware of this since this agreement was from the early 1990s. We also asked if the developer plans to contribute to the HOA. His response was we will maintain our area and not city property. If any apartment complex is approved at this location does the city plan to take over all city property that we maintain or provide us funds each year to assist us in additional maintenance costs? The city has benefitted from Pine Creek maintaining their property for over 25 years at homeowners' additional expense. This year HOA dues are \$1200 per year per home. We do not need between 500 to 800 additional people going through our neighborhoods thus increasing our HOA dues. It is not fair to the city residents in Pine Creek Village.

On June 13th at the city council meeting, Councilman Helms indicated it is not yet a done deal. On July 6th, a neighborhood meeting was held with the city representatives and developer broken up into different groups. The first group I attended, Mr. Posey informed many of us they were still evaluating the proposed development. However at the next station the developer informed us it was pretty much a done deal. Who do we believe? The developer also indicated they have too much money invested in this project. It sounds like the developer is in control and not the city representatives. Do developers still have a huge influence on our local government? I hope not.

I encourage all council members and city planning staff to visit the location and drive throughout Pine Creek. This site for affordable housing or any apartments is not "common sense". This property has been identified for commercial business and should stay that way. If many occupants have no transportation the closest grocery store is King Soopers 1.1 miles walking distance from Royal Pine to Briargate Boulevard. Adverse weather could complicate this even more for these residents. Also, the transportation issue has been brought up many times and visiting the site I believe would benefit all involved in the decision making process, and will agree with the neighborhood residents. This is a 40 million dollar project and should be scrutinized with a fine tooth comb.

Hopefully, "COMMON SENSE" prevails. This is not a good location for any apartments. Recommend this property remains for commercial medical buildings with the existing three medical buildings surrounding the proposed site.

We appreciate Mr. Posey attending both neighborhood meetings and listening to what homeowners had to say and would get back to us on various issues brought up.

I can be reached at 719.291.6541 and would be happy to give anyone a tour showing what responsibility PCVA has on maintaining city property and all the objections of homeowners in Pine Creek have on this project. As a previous PCVA Board member I may be able to provide you additional insight on the PCVA operations.

Sincerely,
Dan Bloom
Pine Creek Homeowner

Hubble, Logan K

From: STEPHEN CLOWSER <scklclowse@comcast.net>
Sent: Saturday, August 5, 2023 2:16 PM
To: Helms, Randy
Cc: Hubble, Logan K; Posey, Steve; cheryl.clowser@gmail.com
Subject: Opposition to proposed Royal Pines Apartments Development Project at Pine Creek

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!

My name is Stephen Clowser. My wife and I live in the Pine Creek area at 3565 Cherry Plum Drive, Colorado Springs, CO 80920. We moved back to Colorado Springs in April 2022 after working in the Washington DC area for over 30 years. I am a retired Army Officer (O-6) and Federal Civilian employee (GS-15 in finance at the Defense Logistics Agency). My wife Cheryl worked for the Army G-2 at the Pentagon. We have two daughters living and working in Northern Virginia. Like many other residents of this community, we chose to purchase a home in the Pine Creek neighborhood for its excellent quality of life, low traffic density, and proximity to my mother (Sun Ridge retirement community), who is eighty-nine and in need of assistance.

When we learned of the proposed Royal Pine Apartments Development to Union and Royal Pine, we were concerned, but wanted to get all the facts before we passed judgment. After researching the project and attending the August 3 meeting for residents conducted by the City Planning Commission, my wife and I feel this project should be disapproved by the City Council.

By far our largest concern is the impact on parking and traffic in the area, as follows:

(1) The 232 proposed apartments, with 312 parking spaces (based on the developer changes made after a prior meeting), are insufficient, we believe, to handle residents and guests. The developer plan includes 144 one-bedroom units, forty-four two-bedroom units, and forty-four, three bedroom-units. We assume each two- and three-bedroom unit will have two vehicles, and at least 25% (conservatively) of one-bedroom units will have two vehicles (co-habituating or married couples) with one vehicle for each one-bedroom unit. That math works out to a requirement for 232 parking spaces proposed by the developer but makes no contingency for ANY deviation for guests/visitors or additional vehicles for three-bedroom apartments (three vehicles if roommates). Overflow parking will end up in the local business lots (Classic Dental, the Veterinary Office), or on Royal Pine and Pine Manor. The posting of no parking signs and towing will not solve this problem given the limited resources of the Colorado Springs Police Department.

(2) The entire Royal Pine Apartments development egress is dependent on a single traffic circle on Royal Pine. The Planning Commission acknowledged that the State of Colorado will not allow construction of another road egress to Union Blvd. As a result, most of the Apartment residents will choose to use Pine Manor as an egress to (1) avoid backups at the traffic circle resulting from waiting for the traffic light at the Union and Royal Pine intersection or (2) avoid the light all together to get to Briargate Parkway. Pine Manor Drive was just recently resurfaced with a new bike lane that takes up approximately 25% of the existing road surface. The speed limit is 30 MPH. School buses pick up and drop off students. There is a large community playground adjacent to Pine Manor. If this development is approved, there will be more cars, speeding, and major safety issues, including evacuation in case of emergencies, such as fire. Morr speed bumps and warning signs will not be

sufficient. Simply put, the existing road infrastructure in the area does not safely and efficiently support the proposed development.

(3) A revised traffic study, as I understand it, is being conducted by the Pine Creek Apartments developer. At the August 3rd meeting the developer failed to adequately address traffic concerns when questioned by the citizenry. The city council, rightly, recently disapproved of the North Fork Development project for traffic concerns that were less onerous than those of the proposed development in Pine Creek. The fact that the Planning Commission recommended approval of the North Fork project indicated that the Planning Commission traffic analysis process is faulty.

We also have environmental concerns. We have a large habitat reservation area that will be within easy walking distance of the proposed development. I grew up in Colorado Springs as a teenager, and I'm very aware that teenagers will find their way into habitat areas to "party". I did it when I was younger. This development will disrupt protected species and other wildlife in the area. We expect that at least 50% of the residents will have pets, and of those pets, half will be dogs that need to be walked. Given the small area the proposed development occupies, along with almost no green space, it's reasonable to assume these residents in the proposed development will walk their dogs on the sidewalks along Pine Manor Drive and to the Pine Creek private park. This will result in more animal waste and pedestrian traffic that will despoil the existing landscaping that the Pine Creek Homeowner's Association maintains with fees on residents.

School overcrowding and over building of apartments in Colorado Springs are other issues that Pine Creek residents have voiced.

Finally, increased crime is another issue. While we expect that most of the proposed new residents will be law abiding citizens and good neighbors, the law of averages, with such a significant increase in population density, tells us that there will be increased criminal activity in our area, particularly attempted house break-ins and car vandalism/theft. As I stated earlier, the Colorado Springs Police Department is already undermanned and unable respond quickly to the many requests they already receive to confront these problems.

In conclusion, I understand the Planning Commission, as a bureaucracy (and I've worked with many at the Federal level), are rule followers. But as a speaker at the August 3rd meeting pointed out, common sense must dictate whether this proposed development makes sense for the community, not just the landowner and the developer. We urge you to (1) oppose the Pine Creek Apartment development project and (2) rezone the property to commercial use, as it was until last year. We're hopeful that the City Council will show the same foresight and common sense they demonstrated when they disapproved of the North Fork development proposal.

Respectfully,

Steve and Cheryl Clowser
3565 Cherry Plum Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80920
scklclowse@comcast.net
(703) 395-6648

Hubble, Logan K

From: Hilary Dussing <hgdussing@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 4, 2023 11:13 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Objection to low income housing in Pine Creek
Attachments: Pine Creek Development.docx

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!

Please see attached letter:
Thank you, Hilary Dussing

Hubble, Logan K

From: M&C Thompson <mcthompson1227@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 3, 2023 4:49 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Subject: Objection to COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141

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 Logan Hubble:

As a concerned taxpayer living near the proposed project site, I object to the development of multi-family apartment complex containing 232 units at the corner of Royal Pine Drive and Union BLVD for the following reasons:

Safety concerns: A single lane roundabout is the only egress point for the development, posing potential risks during emergencies and hindering prompt arrival of first responders.

Strained Emergency Resources and Blocked Evacuation Routes: The proposed high-density property near the Black Forest region could negatively impact emergency resources during a disaster like a wildfire, as it is along a major evacuation route and would burden emergency services already spread thin. Residents' concerns about inequality in emergency services are not addressed in the project plans.

Incorrect traffic study assumptions: The project anticipates adding 2,257 vehicle trips per weekday, with most of the traffic flowing onto Union Boulevard, known for significant backups and high accident rates. The submitted traffic study was not conducted during the school year and does not accurately measure impact to already strained infrastructure.

Lack of accessible transportation: The proposed development's location has a low walkability score (26/100), limited public transportation options (only one bus line with a distant stop), and reduced travel convenience due to the single-lane roundabout.

Strained Education Resources for District 20 Students: The development overlooks the consequences on an already struggling school district with over-enrollment, teacher shortages, and financial challenges.

Overlooked Taxpayer Financial Burdens: The City approved the intent to issue a \$40 million bond for this development, but rising interest rates may cause unexpected losses and residents should be worried about undisclosed taxpayer costs for additional services related to the project.

Negative environmental impacts: The development may endanger and harm a Wildlife Habitat Area. The National Institutes of Health have documented the negative effects of urban sprawl and increased pollution people and the environment.

Strained Community Infrastructure: The development plan fails to address the additional strain on municipal services resulting from the conversion to high-density residential use. It also lacks details on compensating the community for increased burdens on schools and emergency resources. Moreover, there is no consideration for redesigning traffic flow to alleviate the existing stress on roads and patterns.

Counterproductive urban sprawl: Adding over 630 residents in less than 8 acres will strain existing infrastructure, designed for commercial use in the 1980s, creating potential disasters and financial burdens for taxpayers, while the developer's lack of local interest raises concerns about smart growth and sustainability for Colorado Springs.

Impact to Surrounding Land Uses: The development does not consider the impact on surrounding uses, particularly by the United States Air Force Academy (USAFA). In their 2018 Regional Joint Land Use Study, USAFA has identified the incompatible zoning adjacent to flight training areas has increased significantly in the last 20 years. This results in safety concerns for residents falling within flight accident potential zones, and high congestion traffic due to the numerous public events USAFA holds.

I request that the proposed project be DENIED, and reconsider future development plans within Colorado Springs to account for the voice of the community and smart city planning.

I look forward to your prompt response.

Yours sincerely,
Christine Thompson

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

Hubble, Logan K

From: Barbara Vinchattle <vinchattle@icloud.com>
Sent: Thursday, August 3, 2023 11:46 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments

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!

Logan,

I have a question. If the developer's main concern is to provide low income housing, why don't they purchase an existing vacant structure (closed apartments, older closed large retail or corporate buildings, a nearly vacant mall) and remodel them into new apartments? That would seem to take care of two concerns: 1) Producing low income properties for rent, and 2) repurposing vacant buildings that are a blight in current neighborhoods. This would be a better investment of 40 million dollars as it serves a dual positive purpose. There would be existing electricity, gas and water to these types of properties, as well as ample parking. This seems like a very reasonable solution for everyone. By building in the Royal Pine location, they are not providing an improvement for an existing Colorado Springs residential neighborhood, but causing the destruction of an existing residential neighborhood. It would seem that the Royal Pines location is all about making money for the developer and does not consider the concerns or desires of current Colorado Springs residents. Why doesn't the city want something that makes sense for ALL citizens of Colorado Springs. We should not be considering making money for out of state developers!

Barbara Vinchattle

Sent from my iPad

Hubble, Logan K

From: Shawn Brennan <clanbrennan4@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, August 1, 2023 10:53 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Re: The Market at Pine Creek - Royal Pine Apartments

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!

Logan,

Below are my comments for the City and the Developer reference the materials posted as of 1 August 2023 for DEPN-23-0141.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Shawn Brennan
3564 Cherry Plum Drive
720-244-3103

QUESTIONS FOR THE CITY:

- 1) Assuming that the City agrees with the Traffic Impact Study, it still seems prudent to insist on an exit gate from the apartment complex on Union that could be opened for emergency egress by ambulances, fire vehicles, or in case of evacuation. I understand this may require a waiver from CDOT due to the proximity of the Power's Blvd offramp.
- 2) While the Developer's attachments include a breakdown of the \$423,042, they need to pay to cover Parkland, School, and Police/Fire Services, it is unclear to the citizens how that money will be used in our community and what other taxes/fees this apartment complex will pay towards city revenues compared to the "medical offices" originally envisioned for the site.
- 3) Please confirm that the City intends to extend bus route 38 to accommodate this apartment complex and/or add additional public transportation infrastructure to support workforce residents.

QUESTIONS FOR THE DEVELOPER:

- 1) Traffic Impact Study: It was unclear to me exactly how the 3,707 current trips were used in the overall analysis. For studying traffic patterns it may be sufficient, but it should be up-factored to consider the significant differences in traffic volume in the summer (20 June 2023) compared to when school is in session and people are not on vacation.
- 2) Traffic Impact Study states "As noted above, the revised land uses generate significantly fewer trips (2,257 trips) than the maximum allowed (8,441 trips)", but Figure 1 does not leave any estimated allocation for the lot that still remains vacant at the western corner of the overall site.
- 3) Parking Spots: it appears you have calculated the number of parking spots according to city code 7.4.1003 table 7.4.10A dated 28 Mar 2023, but it does not appear that you have taken into consideration the requirements in city code 7.4.1004 which states "Ten (10) percent of the minimum parking required for individual dwelling units shall be provided for guest parking."
- 4) Parking: please provide copies of the policies that will inform the leasing manager and be included in residents' leases to ensure residents and visitors will not park their vehicles in adjacent businesses or the surrounding neighborhood.
- 5) Solar Panels: the drawings show solar panels only on the covered parking canopies, but it was stated at one of the meetings that the apartments (and maybe the community building) would also have solar panels. Please clarify.
- 6) Site Lighting Plan: page 7 of 22 in the submitted drawing package does not seem to take the covered parking canopies into account. Please clarify or correct.
- 7) Grass: page 19 of 22 in the submitted drawing package (and the Drainage Plan) calls for grass for the community areas, but the designer at the public meeting suggested that artificial turf might be the preferred option. Please clarify.

- 8) The fenced dog run on page 20 of 22 in the submitted drawing package seems sadly small for the number of pets that 232 apartments may contain. Please consider enlarging.
- 9) The bike racks on page 6 of 22 in the submitted drawing package may meet city code but are not conducive in design or location for the secure and attractive storage of residents' bikes. Please consider more modern designs to encourage bike usage and discourage theft.
- 10) Please have a professional snowplow company review your layout and parking plans; it is not clear to me from looking at page 3 or 22 that there will be places to pile heavy snow when needed.
- 11) Submitted package did not include details about the planned design of the trash & recycling centers to ensure they are suitable for the area to discourage wildlife issues.

On Thu, Jul 6, 2023 at 4:27 PM Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

Quick update to those who have reached out to me regarding the Market at Pine Creek/Royal Pines Apartments project. The applicant has submitted the development plan, which I have sent out to agencies for review.

If you wish to view the proposed development plan and associated documents, you can do so at [ColoradoSprings.gov/LDRS](https://coloradosprings.gov/LDRS) by searching the record number DEPN-23-0141. If you click the "record info" tab and then click "attachments," the website will allow you to see the uploaded documents. If you wish to comment on the proposed plans, please send them to me, and I will compile them in a document, to which the applicant will be required to respond.

Neighbors living within 1,000 feet of the site can expect to receive a postcard regarding the project. You can also feel free to share the information contained within this email, as well as the link to the documents, with any other interested parties. I will continue to send updates as the process continues. Please contact me with any questions you might have.

Thank you,

Logan Hubble

Planner II

30 S Nevada Ave. Suite 701

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

(719) 385-5099

Logan.Hubble@ColoradoSprings.gov



Hubble, Logan K

From: Verdie Williams <vplbw@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2023 7:59 PM
To: Posey, Steve; Hubble, Logan K; Helms, Randy; Yemi Mobolade; Crow-Iverson, Lynette; Leinweber, David; Riskey, Brian; Donelson, Dave; Talarico, Michelle; Avila, Yolanda; Henjum, Nancy; OMalley, Mike (Council Member)
Subject: COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141, Royal Pines Apartment Complex
Importance: High

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!

7/31/2023

Mr. Mayor, Steve Posey, Logan Hubble, Council Members

Subject: COPN-23-0015 and DEPN-23-0141

Dear Mr. Mayor, Steve Posey, Logan Hubble & all Council Members,

I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the proposed development of a multi-family apartment complex containing 232 units at the corner of Royal Pine Drive and Union BLVD. While I understand the need for housing development, there are several significant issues that you need to be address before approving this development.

First, I would like to draw your attention to the **safety concerns** that this development will impose on the surrounding area, especially as it relates to traffic during an emergency. The location of this complex requires all vehicles to utilize a single lane roundabout to access Union BLVD. This roundabout is already shared by three businesses, their patrons, and 1,424 single-family houses within the surrounding Pine Creek Village, as well as delivery drivers and visitors. In the event of a fire emergency, as occurred in Boulder, CO (Marshall Fire), this single egress point will quickly become congested with traffic, increasing the potential for loss of life.

This concentration of traffic at one exit point raises serious apprehensions about emergency vehicular access for both the residents of the multi-family housing complex and the existing community. In the event of an emergency, such as a fire or medical crisis, the current traffic conditions will undoubtedly hinder the prompt arrival of first responders, especially for the very large ladder trucks the apartments will require. This poses a significant risk to the safety and well-being of all residents in the vicinity.

Moreover, the traffic study conducted for this development incorrectly assumes that each of the 1,424 existing residents would only leave their houses once per day and it was done during the summer, when school is not in session, and many are on vacation. Daily routines often involve multiple trips for various activities such as work, school, errands, and social engagements. Consequently, the projected traffic volume provided by the study does not accurately reflect the actual impact that this multi-family apartment complex will have on the surrounding roadways. A traffic study from 2006 showed that a single drive thru restaurant would greatly exceed the maximum trip count of 8,441; however, this developer states that the addition of 632 new people to the area will reduce traffic counts – this is impossible.

Second, this development will lead to **negatively impact the health** of the apartment residents and adjacent residents, but also the endangered species residing in the Wildlife Habitat Area close by. The National Institutes of Health and others have documented the negative effects of urban sprawl on people and the environment. These include higher rates of chronic illnesses, increased pollution, and degraded habitats. Because this location has a very poor walkability score (26:100), these residents will have to drive to reach their destination, thereby increasing noise, light, air, and chemical pollution, reducing exercise, and straining species already close to extinction.

Third, this development is **not in the public interest**, as the residents of Pine Creek Village were told this land was for commercial uses (planned business complex), supported by a large sign on the property that reads, “Coming Soon, 45,000 ft square Medical Office Building.” Many purchased their homes to get away from the pollution and traffic associated with other parts of the city that have incorporated high-density housing.

The residents that will live in the apartments will not benefit from having shops close by, as many other apartments offer. The walking score is very low, there is only one bus route with a stop nearly ½ mile away, and ease of travel via car is greatly diminished by the single-lane roundabout.

It is not in the public interest to have high-density housing close to the Wildlife Habitat Area, as it will negatively impact the animals this area was built to protect. The protection of endangered and threatened species is in the public interest for the current and for future generations. Animals often seen in the area are the Preble’s Meadow Jumping Mouse, Lynx, Fox, Bald Eagle, Golden Eagle, Peregrine Falcon, and Common Garter Snake. There are also several imperiled and vulnerable plant species that continued deserve protection.

Fourth, having a large apartment complex adjacent to existing office buildings and Pine Creek Village will be a **great inconvenience**. Traffic in the area will nearly double and create significant delays and congestion at the single-lane roundabout. In addition, the

additional traffic through the neighborhood as new residents use Pine Manor Drive to reach Briargate BLVD will create additional noise, light, and air pollution and place animals from the Wildlife Habitat Area crossing the road at increased risk of death or severe injury. The school buses will have to navigate through increased delays and accommodate more students, in an already over-crowded, under-staffed school district. The new residents will not be in a good walking area, as even the closest location is nearly a 15-minute walk across six lanes of heavy traffic. The single city bus line (38) in the area has a stop almost ½ mile away, and only runs on Union BLVD, whereby riders must transfer to other buses to reach any destination, taking significant time.

Lastly, this development is **counter to the general welfare** of the city and community it will effect. Urban sprawl is the best way to describe Colorado Springs and the negative effects of this are myriad. Urban sprawl creates serious implications for infrastructure and environmental sustainment. Placing 630+ new residents in an area of less than 8 acres will place unplanned burdens on our aging and frail infrastructure. This area was designed in the 1980s to be commercial and the road and infrastructure were planned against this. Increasing the population without improving the infrastructure could be disastrous for the city and costly for its taxpayers. The developer is not from Colorado and has no interest in the smart growth or sustainment of Colorado Springs outside of his own financial gain.

Considering the above concerns, I implore the city to reconsider this development and undertake a comprehensive evaluation of the potential impacts on the community. It is crucial that the city and its departments conduct a thorough analysis of every area of concern to ensure the well-being and quality of life for both existing and future residents in the area.

I kindly request that you address these concerns and take the necessary steps to mitigate the potential adverse effects of this proposal. By doing so, you will demonstrate your commitment to the safety, health, public interest, convenience, and general welfare of the community you serve.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that you will carefully consider the valid concerns the residents have raised and decide to stop this development. I look forward to your prompt response.

Yours sincerely,

Paul & Verdie Williams
4256 Apple Hill Ct
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

Hubble, Logan K

From: Wintz, Katelynn A
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2023 3:15 PM
To: Holly Lawrence
Cc: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: RE: Pinecreek Apartments

Hi Holly –

I appreciate your comments. I've included the project planner who will ensure your comments are compiled into the project record.

The financing arm of this application is not part of the development plan review process to ensure compliance with our City Unified Development Code, though I do understand your line of questioning.

The apartments you note below are, to my knowledge, all "market-rate" apartments, meaning they can charge a premium for their services which serves a different portion of the City population than residents which may qualify for affordable housing.

Thank you for your continued interest in the application under review in our office. I hope to see you Thursday!
Kate



Katelynn Wintz, AICP (she/her)
Planning Supervisor
Land Use Review Division
City of Colorado Springs
Office: (719) 385-5192
Email: katelynn.wintz@coloradosprings.gov
[Why Pronouns?](#)

Links:

[Planning & Community Development Home](#)
[Look at Applications Online \(LDRS\)](#)
[Pre-Application Meeting Request](#)

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

From: Holly Lawrence <hnorvelle@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2023 2:42 PM
To: Wintz, Katelynn A <Katelynn.Wintz@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Pinecreek Apartments

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 Katelynn,

We are researching as much data as possible in rejection to the proposed Pine Creek Apartments.

1. \$40 Million Dollars for 15 year requirement that helps reduce rent for a few. Is this in the best interest of the taxpayers? I say NO- it is in the interest of the developer. Out of state means profit.

I am including other data. There are so many areas that can be revitalized and existing apartments that could be incentivised for rent aid/discount.

This Proposal is not compatible with this neighborhoods infrastructure, Habitat for animals etc.

As an owner in this neighborhood I have Pride for our neighborhood and take care of it- When I was a renter in an apartment I did not see everyone take pride in their surroundings.

This is why we are having a building boom and the planning commission made the building codes developer friendly.
<https://www.enr.com/articles/56151-colorado-springs-invests-in-itself-to-spur-growth>

Our unoccupancy rates have gone up to 7.5% , this is approaching the 9% rate of the early 2000 when all development stopped until occupancy caught up. It took about 15 years to occupy all the buildings.

2006 HUD Report for COS , 9%vacancy rate
https://www.huduser.gov/portal/publications/pdf/CMAR_ColoSpringsCO.pdf

Vacancy rate as of 27 Jul 23 Excellent Article, Current 7.5%Vacancy Rate
https://gazette.com/premium/report-shows-vacancy-rates-are-spiking-in-colorado-springs-will-more-apartments-mean-cheaper-rent/article_eae9421e-1d04-11ee-ba54-c7346f3cea7e.html

https://www.csbj.com/news/colorado-springs-apartment-market-likely-to-be-overbuilt/article_2d377372-f346-11ed-924d-abb6039b19e8.html

Pine Creek will be surrounded on the East and West side by 1,025 apartments if all are built. Apartments are – The Zeb = 193, Elements at Briargate = 300, Apt behind T-Mobile = 300, Royal Pine = 232. This is not counting the super huge apartment complex at the mall with 5 different apartment complexes.

We will be sandwiched in ! This is a SAFETY hazard!

We will have approximately an additional 2,050+Mall people to use King Soopers, Briargate Parkway, Briargate Blvd, Academy Blvd, Chapel Hills, and Union.
Current Vacancies

These apartments are very nice and they have vacancies with incentives to rent. With all of their amenities, Royal Pine Apt will not be desirable.

The Elements at Briargate = 15 vacancies out of 300.

The Zeb has 18 vacancies out of 193.

The Sagebrook- current apartment complex on Briargate Parkway has 35 vacancies projected until Oct 14, 2023.

Holly Lawrence

Hubble, Logan K

From: Stevo Parrish <armydad1972@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2023 3:13 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: PineCreek VillageNeighbors
Subject: DEPN-23-0141

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!

Logan,

I am writing to address concerns related to the development of Royal Pines Apartments (DEPN-23-0141).

This development will have a negative effect on the existing community, the businesses, and not benefit the new residents of the apartments.

The Development Plan document 21754-01DP COMPLETE has some problems the City needs to have the developer address.

1. On page 6, I don't see where the 4-story apartments will have fire hydrants or adequate access for ladder trucks that will have to respond to a structure fire.

2. On page 7, the lighting shows variances in illumination within the same distances from the light sources, which illustrates inconsistency through estimation. The page states that "There will be no off-site glare," however, that is impossible to achieve, especially for those residents that reside near this complex. Light cannot be contained with shielding. It can only be directed. The further away the light (in this case 50 feet high) is from the source, the more scatter occurs. At four stories, light will glare onto the Wildlife Area and our residences.

3. The zoning guidelines restrict building height to 50 feet. However, on page 10, the design shows the structure exceeds 50 feet by 1 foot, 8 inches. This violates City zoning and is clear in their design.

4. The appearance of this structure does not support theme of Pine Creek that the residents of Pine Creek Village and the businesses are beholden too. It is too tall and does not meet the themes La Plata set out for PC (Craftsman, Prairie, Spanish Eclectic, and European Cottage are the only architectural styles permitted in Pine Creek).

5. The height of the buildings will allow apartments to look into both the businesses and backyards of Pine Creek adjacent to it. This violates their expectation of privacy as patients and residents.

V/r
Steve Parrish
719-464-4220

Preserve Pine Creek Village, LLC.

Hubble, Logan K

From: Friedman, Samuel
Sent: Monday, July 31, 2023 7:37 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: FW: Pine Creek Apartments

Your email was wrong here. So forwarding

Sam Friedman
Constituent and Outreach Program Coordinator Legislative Services, City of Colorado Springs
(719) 385-5480 office

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

From: Ross King <rpkingcs@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 28, 2023 7:54 PM
To: Helms, Randy <Randy.Helms@coloradosprings.gov>
Cc: Posey, Steve <Steve.Posey@coloradosprings.gov>; loran.hubble@coloradosprings.gov
Subject: Pine Creek Apartments

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,

I'd like to voice my concern about the proposal to build several four story apartment buildings directly adjacent to the nearby Pine Creek neighborhoods. The height of these apartments, at approximately fifty feet, in no way matches the area around it. Along with the visual impacts the shear density of apartments will increase the population in this immediate area and overwhelm both the nearby ingress/egress to the neighborhood.

There are numerous areas up north, even the area around the North Memorial Hospital has three direct exits to handle the increased density.

Smaller townhomes or two story apartments at the height of the existing OBGYN building is far more an appropriate use of the area.

Thank you,
Ross King

Sent from my iPhone

Hubble, Logan K

From: Janet Rahmani <janrahmani10@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 29, 2023 7:13 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments

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 Logan Hubble:

As we learn more about the proposed apartment complex called Royal Pine Apartments, we become more concerned about what this Development will do to our quiet neighborhood. We are terrible concerned about the additional traffic around our circle as well as the Increased noise. We are highly doubtful of the circle's capacity to carry that much more traffic coming from the apartments. The noise and congestion will lead to more accidents and unruly confrontations. We moved here to enjoy a quiet retirement in what we thought was a quiet, non-stressful neighborhood. And while I realize that many low-income folks are good, hardworking people, there are those who are anything but. We are justifiably concerned that we may experience an increase in crime also.

In summary, we don't feel that this is the appropriate location for a low income apartment complex. We sincerely hope you will reconsider Approving it.

Sincerely,

Janet and Hertzal Rahmani
9648 Snowberry Circle
Colorado Springs, CO. 80920

Hubble, Logan K

From: davepuerta@comcast.net
Sent: Saturday, July 29, 2023 3:51 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Fwd: Proposed Apartment Complex

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!

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

From: davepuerta@comcast.net
To: "Dave.Donelson@Coloradosprings.gov" <Dave.Donelson@Coloradosprings.gov>
Date: 07/29/2023 1:09 PM MDT
Subject: Proposed Apartment Complex

Dave, while it has been several months since our initial meeting, I was very impressed by your experience and involvement with the workings of our City Government. It is my understanding that you were only one of two Council Members that opposed the Royal Pines Apartment proposal.

There is another Meeting of residents planned for August 3, 2023 at Library 21C 5:30-7:30PM and your participation would be appreciated. The initial meeting of residents/Developer was worthless as we were dived into four small groups and questions were not audible and the response to most questions was "we will have to look into that."

About 200 Residents attended along with the Developers. Chief Housing Officer, Steve Posey, also attended. His contribution was almost nonexistent

Several residents offered alternate locations that would be more suitable for this proposal and all were totally ignored "due to not being available or too expensive".

Our concerns were, not adequate parking and the impact that excess parking would have on local HOA regulations and the three small business already at this location. The impact on local Hospitals, the elementary Schools and local Police Enforcement. There is no Public Transportation at this location and local businesses would not provide adequate employment opportunities for those willing to work. In addition the proposed vehicle access from a "Round About" is very restricted and in the event of a fire emergency would not permit Emergency Vehicle access. Lastly this site would require extensive infrastructure modifications to both Electric and Water Utility upgrades.

This proposed Complex is directly adjacent to our "Wildlife Preserve". and is the home of many protected animals, deer and other smaller inhabitants. It would be destroyed by the introduction of waste runoff and domestic pets.

Your continued support and advise on how to get more involved would be appreciated.

Dave Puerta

davepuerta@comcast.net

719 442 0053

Hubble, Logan K

From: mail2srv@aol.com
Sent: Saturday, July 29, 2023 9:39 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments Objection

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!

The City's land conversion from commercial to high-density to develop the low-income Royal Pine Apartments seriously impacts the Pine Creek Community. **How was this even possible on a parcel with covenants prohibiting such development?** As a concerned taxpayer, I object to the development for the following reasons:

- Safety - Additional traffic. Congestion increases potential of pedestrian and vehicular accidents associated with limited access and road infrastructure design, especially during rush-hour traffic and school in-session timeframe. Negative impact on emergency services traveling to the area in the event of a wildfire or other disaster.
- Public Interest - Negative impact to the critical watershed ecosystem directly adjacent to the planned development from increased quantity, intensity, and frequency of overland water flow. Added burden to already overcrowded schools and emergency resources. Surrounding neighborhoods oppose the development. Threatened Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse's habitat endangered. Birds of prey affected. Wildlife displaced.
- Convenience - Infrastructure and services were not designed or built to handle the continuous-use population. Added traffic.
- Health: The critical riparian area adjacent to the development supports the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse's endangered habitat as well as diverse flora and fauna that adds value to the community. Environmental Impacts include:
 1. Increase in overland water flow on the drainage basin increasing erosion/flood potential and adversely affecting the quality of downstream water but also the downstream waterways/riparian areas structural integrity.
 2. Environmental noise impacts due to an increase in high-density occupancy.
 3. Adverse air pollution impacts harming our families and community due to increased vehicular idling, traffic flow congestion, and increased vehicular traffic as a result of the development from NO_x (Nitric oxide (NO) and Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂)) and particulate matter emissions.
 4. Adverse thermal temperature pollution to the area due to increased building materials that will generate an increase in ambient temperature
 5. Adverse environmental impact on the surrounding green spaces and critical habitat, since local parks are not easily accessible, to sustainably support the increased constant stressors due to increased foot/pet traffic as well as pet waste.

6. Increase in waste pollution carried by the wind and overland water flow deposited in critical habitat areas impacting the flow dynamics of the drainage area and water quality.

- General Welfare - This project is not a good fit for the neighborhood because of the number of adverse environmental and community impacts sited in addition to the associated decreases in property values; increased occupancy in the area has the potential for increased crime with adverse impacts on the quality of life as a result.

Sincerely,

Sandra Vicksta

Hubble, Logan K

From: Ross King <rpkingcs@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 29, 2023 8:49 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Pine creek apartments

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,

I'd like to voice my concern about the proposal to build several four story apartment buildings directly adjacent to the nearby Pine Creek neighborhoods. The height of these apartments, at approximately fifty feet, in no way matches the area around it. Along with the visual impacts the sheer density of apartments will increase the population in this immediate area and overwhelm both the nearby ingress/egress to the neighborhood.

There are numerous areas up north, even the area around the North Memorial Hospital has three direct exits to handle the increased density.

Smaller townhomes or two story apartments at the height of the existing OBGYN building is far more an appropriate use of the area.

Thank you,
Ross King

Hubble, Logan K

From: Aaron P <aarow@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 28, 2023 5:12 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Pehrson - The Market at Pine Creek Concept Plan - COPN-23-0015
Attachments: The Market at Pine Creek Proposed Development Project - Comments.pdf

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!

Logan,

Thank you for considering the issue of plot revision of The Market at Pine Creek located at Royal Pine and Union Blvd. Have the issues attached been resolved since 2007? There is a call for a new & updated traffic count and multiple other safety issues to include fire, water and egress standards. The traffic count issue also has a sunset clause demanding a current survey of actual use throughout the neighborhood to include regular traffic from September 2023 and not during slower traffic generation highlighted by summer school absence.

v/r,
Aaron Pehrson
9667 Snowberry Circle
Colorado Springs, CO
80920

Hubble, Logan K

From: RICHARD W GONSER <gons1@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 27, 2023 12:36 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine apartments

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!

We object to the development of the Royal Pine Apartments because this site is not suitable for 244 apartments. It is a real safety issue for the apartment residents, as well as the nearby home residents. If there should be a fire at these apartments for example, their only evacuation would be to use Royal Pine Drive as there isn't an exit onto Union or Powers Blvd. How would fire engines reach the fire if the apartment residents were trying to evacuate in a hurry? There would be over 300 people trying to exit at the same time.

Also, i was wondering if the developer is required to get approval from the fish and game department since they are the ones who protect the wildlife area nearby, and the protection of the Prebbles mouse habitat.

Thank you for your time,
Barbara Gonser

Sent from my iPad

Hubble, Logan K

From: ROGER BAER <BAERRC@msn.com>
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2023 11:30 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: pinecreekvillageneighbors@pb07.wixemails.com
Subject: Proposed Royal Pine Apartments

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!

Logan:

Regarding the updated Concept Plan that DBG Properties submitted recently for the proposed Royal Pine apartments, the traffic impact study (TIS) is not valid because the study was done during a low usage period when many Pine Creek and Cordera residents are on vacation AND more importantly, area elementary, middle and high schools are not in session. The streets leading in and out of the area of the proposed Royal Pine Apartments have several bus routes and there is no way that these were taken into account. Also, student pedestrian traffic also was not accounted for.

We are sure that you are aware that school sessions are 9 months out of the year and **we want you to explain how a TIS taken during the non-school session time of year could have any validity.** The study needs to be taken during the weekdays when school is in session.

For the record, we are very much opposed to this proposed apartment complex because the infrastructure is NOT at all ready for an influx of densely populated housing and this will raise safety and traffic issues to our much-valued community.

Please respond.

Thank you

Roger & Laurie Baer
Pine Creek Residents

Hubble, Logan K

From: Tricia Del Guercio <tricia@nonprofitadvisor.org>
Sent: Wednesday, July 26, 2023 10:49 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: RE: Royal Pines Apartments Concept Plan - COPN-23-0015

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!

Logan,

Regarding the new concept plan submitted and the traffic impact study for the proposed Royal Pines Apartments.

I am completely in alignment with Mr Wilkerson (my neighbor) feelings recently expressed to you by email regarding the traffic study.

“There is a major deficiency in the traffic study which concludes that the existing infrastructure is suitable for the development. The deficiency is that the measured traffic was taken on June 20, 2023 when school is not in session and people are out of town on vacation. I’m estimating that there are between 500 and 1,000 students that go through the roundabout at Royal Pine and Purple Plum on school days. All of those are probably within a 45 minute window before school and again after school. For that reason I feel another traffic study should be performed during the school year, not just during the summer when traffic is significantly lighter. “

We would appreciate your attention to this matter.

Respectfully,

Patricia Del Guercio
702-203-7399
Pine Creek Resident

From: Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2023 1:42 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments Concept Plan - COPN-23-0015

Hello,

Quick update regarding the Royal Pines Apartments project:

- The applicant has resubmitted the Royal Pines Apartments concept plan, as well as a traffic impact study and responses to neighbor comments. If you wish to view the proposed development plan and associated documents, you can do so at [ColoradoSprings.gov/LDRS](https://coloradosprings.gov/LDRS) by searching the record number COPN-23-0015. If you click the “record info” tab and then click “attachments,” the website will allow you to see the uploaded documents. If you wish to comment on the proposed plans, please send them to me, and I will compile them in a document, to which the applicant will be required to respond. These comments are due by August 2nd.

- The city-facilitated neighborhood meeting will be taking place from 5:30-7:30pm on Thursday, August 3, at Library 21c. I will be unable to attend, but my supervisor and a number of other Planning Department staff members will be there. If you have questions about the neighborhood meeting on the day of the meeting, please contact my supervisor, Katelynn Wintz (Katelynn.Wintz@ColoradoSprings.gov). Otherwise, continue to contact me with any comments or questions.

Thank you,

Logan Hubble

Planner II

30 S Nevada Ave. Suite 701

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

(719) 385-5099

Logan.Hubble@ColoradoSprings.gov



Hubble, Logan K

From: Cristy Fisher <drchristy@pinecreekvet.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 23, 2023 8:33 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K; Posey, Steve; Helms, Randy
Subject: URGENT !! Market at Pine Creek = Affordable housing project - COMMERCIAL use ONLY
Attachments: Joint Covenants and Easement Agreement.pdf

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 Logan, Steve, and Randy

I understand there is significant controversy over the proposed development plan for the Market at Pine Creek and the affordable housing project the city is currently working on with the developer.

I do hope you know this annexed area has current covenants in place for ***exclusively nonresidential use***. Please see the attached covenants for this area of Briargate. We keep hearing that the area is "already" labelled for mixed residential use but it is NOT!

I have attached a copy of the current binding covenants we (all three business owners and the seller) have had in place for this land use. All three facilities in the Market at Pine Creek VERY SPECIFICALLY purchased our lots years ago because of this restricted use. We are all small business owners employing numerous Colorado Springs citizens - YOUR constituents. The developer doesn't even live in the state of Colorado, so I am NOT sure why the city, OUR CITY, isn't proactively fighting tooth and nail to protect OUR RIGHTS as citizens of Colorado Springs but also long standing employers, tax payers and voters.

Surely this is an oversight by the city, because I can't believe that our city representatives would so blatantly ignore the needs of the CURRENT business owners who are also residents of this community.

The specific section in the covenants stating this is for NONRESIDENTIAL use is:

Section 10.21 of the covenants specifically states that "Each lot within the annexed area is hereby restricted exclusively to nonresidential use". That section goes on to state that the property is only subject to 3 provisions of the Colorado common interest ownership act. This is a clear intention of the drafters of this document to ensure that the property would not be used for residential purposes.

I trust that you, as our fellow residents and committee members will FIGHT for us and say NO to this illegal venture solely intended as a money grab.

I implore you all to do the right thing and put a stop to the current location of this development. Please reach out to me with any questions or comments.

--

Regards,
Cristy Fisher, DVM

Medical Director
Pine Creek Veterinary Hospital

719.955.0966 ext 107
www.pinecreekvet.com

Hubble, Logan K

From: ALFRED PETERSON <outlook_40845A8D69D54365@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2023 5:01 PM
To: Posey, Steve; Hubble, Logan K; Helms, Randy
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments

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 just read the Trip Generation Memo for these apartments and I am disgusted with it. For over 300 apartments "the proposed site is anticipated to generate 149 trips (57 in and 92 out)".

Really. No mention is made that it is single access into a round-about. The 2.72 residents per dwelling is also and understatement.

I continue to believe that the City is not representing the residents of the existing single family community Pine Creek by supporting this project. The recently upheld objection to the apartment project on the Westside due to egress and exit should be equally challenging for the Pine Creek community. Only Royal Pine and Old Ranch provide exit.

Thank you.

Al Peterson
3725 Palazzo Grove

Hubble, Logan K

From: Colleen L <cplboiler@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2023 3:48 PM
To: Jim Wilkerson
Cc: Hubble, Logan K; Yemi Mobolade; Helms, Randy; Brian Livie; Cliff Bratten; Posey, Steve; Eric Grodahl; Stevo Parrish; Chase Vendl; jeff osborne; SUSAN FORGET; Britta Emenecker; Caralee Frederic; Stacy Henning; Rick Lancaster; Phil Moehlenpah; Bill; DEBORAH HARNEY; Julie; Stephen Swiatek; Christy Azzopardi; Ben Ekberg; Larry Borland; MARK M-M; Nathalie Ingram; John and Kristi; Jacque Rindgen-DeCecco; Sandy Garlie; Vicki Kapron; aarow@aol.com; Sunshine Group LLC; Kathy Gorabohl; Al Peterson; RICHARD W GONSER; Dale Brocklehurst; Ed Perkett; Tricia Del Guercio; kend7737; Joseph O'Keefe; Brey Murray; Keri Roberts; Richard Brown; PineCreek VillageNeighbors; matvr@msn.com; jnkdmac@me.com; Shawn Brennan; Joel Kane; CLAUD KNIGHT; Crystal Shields; pjstrait@aol.com; Patty Baer; allen@wildatheart.org; Bob King; Eric Newman; Jonathan Schultz; Joshua Majors; Amy Bulik; Roderic Rau; Tracy C; mail2srv@aol.com; Medical Marketing 411; Rachael Griffin; Kancir, Cindy; gskancir; stcglen@comcast.net; elliotjl1@comcast.net; Michael Gebhardt; Todd Matthews; Holly Lawrence; Walsh Jessica; Todd Borg; Eddie Lawrence; dharnly@q.com; Jim Zendejas; Ed Maitland; Lexie Borg; carolehun39; buddy robbins; Melinda Robbins; Omar Wyman; B1Dobbs; Susan Harvey; Ross Moore; Teresa Smith; monica wilcox; loumdusa@aol.com; LINDA ELSBERRY; Al Weber; Robbie Weber; Lindsey Trylch; Jim Eken; Dana Eken; BARBARA VINCHATTLE; Michelle Matthews; Wintz, Katelynn A
Subject: Re: Deficiency in Traffic Impact Study for Royal Pines Apartments Concept Plan - COPN-23-0015
Attachments: image001.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!

Also there is a need for a traffic study on Pine Manor.

On Thu, Jul 20, 2023, 3:31 PM Jim Wilkerson <jimgolfer4@gmail.com> wrote:

Logan,

Thank you for the new concept plan submitted today and the traffic impact study for the proposed Royal Pines Apartments . I feel there is a major deficiency in the traffic study which concludes that the existing infrastructure is suitable for the development. The deficiency is that the measured traffic was taken on June 20, 2023 when school is not in session and people are out of town on vacation. I'm estimating that there are between 500 and 1,000 students that go through the roundabout at Royal Pine and Purple Plum on school days. All of those are probably within a 45 minute window before school and again after school. For that reason I feel another traffic study should be performed during the school year, not just during the summer when traffic is significantly lighter.

This is my first time emailing you and I don't know how to get this info out to the entire audience. I will let you take care of that if more parties need to be informed of my comments Thank you.

Regards,
Jim Wilkerson
3662 Tuscanna Grove
Colorado Springs

On Jul 20, 2023, at 1:42 PM, Hubble, Logan K <Logan.Hubble@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hello,

Quick update regarding the Royal Pines Apartments project:

- The applicant has resubmitted the Royal Pines Apartments concept plan, as well as a traffic impact study and responses to neighbor comments. If you wish to view the proposed development plan and associated documents, you can do so at [ColoradoSprings.gov/LDRS](https://coloradosprings.gov/LDRS) by searching the record number COPN-23-0015. If you click the “record info” tab and then click “attachments,” the website will allow you to see the uploaded documents. If you wish to comment on the proposed plans, please send them to me, and I will compile them in a document, to which the applicant will be required to respond. These comments are due by August 2nd.
- The city-facilitated neighborhood meeting will be taking place from 5:30-7:30pm on Thursday, August 3, at Library 21c. I will be unable to attend, but my supervisor and a number of other Planning Department staff members will be there. If you have questions about the neighborhood meeting on the day of the meeting, please contact my supervisor, Katelynn Wintz (Katelynn.Wintz@ColoradoSprings.gov). Otherwise, continue to contact me with any comments or questions.

Thank you,

Logan Hubble

Planner II

30 S Nevada Ave. Suite 701

Colorado Springs, CO 80903

(719) 385-5099

Logan.Hubble@ColoradoSprings.gov



Hubble, Logan K

From: Jim Blair <froggy@mate@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 20, 2023 12:35 PM
To: Sunderlin, Katie
Cc: Hubble, Logan K; Posey, Steve
Subject: Re: Royal Pine Apartments

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!

Thanks Katie. I am reviewing a lot of information on the city website.

However, there is a huge disconnect among the city staff on the communications required at the local neighborhood level like with many of the local HOA's .

In short, with the exception of the two informational meetings with DBG no one from the city has ever come down to coordinate or engage with Pine Creek residents exclusive of the random public interviews you've referenced on the general theme of affordable housing.

The perception is that you folks including major decision makers (both government and business) are targeting various areas within each council district for Affordable Housing.

If so, those communities being targeted need a totally transparent government that is inclusive and actively coordinates and communicates in the early stages planning and decision making process not after things have been decided and are being executed just like the "planned" Royal Pines Apartments.

From my perspective the train has already left the station. All the news articles, comments by city staff, and the political leadership all speak as if it is a done deal. I sincerely hope this is not the case.

Many have this view because of severe lobbying on the part of developers to get the city council to change various zoning ordinances to multi purpose followed by the State authorization for our Colorado Springs to issue PAB's. PAB's that if not issued the City will lose and revert back to the State.

This coupled with a developer like DBG and a city staff that knows how to play the affordable housing game has just exacerbated the problems at the local neighborhood grassroots level like here in Pine Creek.

Besides my previous points the lack of communication and transparency with the residents of Pine Creek is the biggest issue and is probably no more indicative than the upcoming planned rental homes for the Cordera neighborhood.

Just curious if anyone in the city ever reached out to that HOA to include and coordinate with them in the early planning process?

While one would assume La Plata as the developer of Cordera is the most likely party already included in the planning process from the beginning one would assume based on the sudden communications between Pine Creek residents and DBG that similar communications have most likely not taken place with Cordera residents. I might be wrong but just my guess.

As you know, the new Mayor has called for such communications and transparency but up until now I have not seen any proactive movement in this area.

(BTW, a great start would be the requirement that every city staff member, advisory committee, commissions, etc post their full biography on the city website so that the public has a true sense of just whose running the city government on their behalf- this also includes the City Council)

Katie, the reason you folks are getting so much push back like your experiencing with our group in Pine Creek is the “surprise” nature and the city staff’s close relationship with developers and in particular identifying land to accommodate proposed affordable housing while ignoring and not establishing close relationships with local residents here in Pine Creek and perhaps coordinating early on with us and other neighborhoods at the grassroots level with local leaders, HOA’s etc. in order to determine overall receptiveness and feasibility.

Again, the key is advanced coordination that includes local neighborhoods at the beginning of the planning thought process.

When folks in my neighborhood here both the current and former mayor, city council representatives, and staff say “we are a home rule government and we don’t want Denver telling us what to do” the same philosophy applies at the local level in that local neighborhoods have a similar position that the city of Colorado Springs bureaucracy has no business telling local residents who should be living in their neighborhoods via an affordable housing program; a Federal socialized government housing program that is viewed by the public as being created under the current Federal political veneer of the diversity, equity, and inclusion theme.

I fully support affordable housing program as long as people understand that it is more of an issue of low wages than just affording housing. (Note: you won’t hear the local Chamber of Commerce taking a position on low wages. They know this is a delicate hot potato within the small business community).

Regardless, another one of my other biggest concerns are those folks getting affordable housing benefits that continue to game the system by having their boyfriend or girlfriend move in with them along with that individuals “phantom” income that when calculated will exceed the income thresholds used as qualifiers for affordable housing.

In the case of Royal Pines or any other planned affordable housing projects you may say 230 apartments but is the community ready for a doubling of planned residents, many who may live there as “significant others” indirectly receiving housing subsistence along with their “phantom” income?

From a City perspective you folks are probably not concerned with such behavior and more concerned in the planning and implementation areas.

Also not so much concerned about what happens from a property valuation and apartment property management side of the equation along with anticipating the ensuing traffic, crime, and poverty problems 10-15yrs from now.

Case in point is the urban blight associated with the Inner Cities who for the most part had housing originally designated as the equivalent of todays affordable housing program 60 yrs ago that is now identified as Section 8.

To appease the habitants in these rat infested places the Federal government under both political parties just continue to throw money at the problem via landlords, non profit property owners and property management companies instead of finding any permanent solution.

At the local level are the current and future socio economic conditions as a result of the infamous Powers Blvd corridor multi use development fiasco!

Now fully loaded with apartments and now loaded with traffic jams! Now we want to expand the last gap by loading in more affordable housing between the Briargate area and Interquest so that we have affordable housing “where the rich people live” (quote by a couple of our governmental and staff leadership types).

Accordingly, my prediction is that given the current build out of affordable housing apartments, Colorado Springs will eventually have within 10-15 yrs a series of Section 8/inner city areas similar to large metropolitan areas like Denver, Chicago, New York, LA.

The big for me question for me and should be for our City leadership is just how much is enough? How much can our infrastructure and respective communities support? More importantly, in all reality does the City leadership care what the local residents think about affordable housing in their neighborhoods. Based on the voting records on affordable housing projects it would appear not.

If the city cannot provide and adequately support affordable housing then maybe we stop building. Maybe individuals leaving their high paying jobs in California, New York, and Chicago reconsider and not move here until wages are improved by the business community.

This is not intended to be insensitive but the city leadership has to at some point say NO regardless how much free money they want throw at us. We have major water issues along with other infrastructure challenges. Might be a good time for the Mayor and City Council to place a temporary hold on the entire affordable housing program; and audit the whole program and process!

Katie, I know that many of my above comments and opinions are outside your scope of responsibilities but I think it's good that city staff like you and other folks have a better understanding of grassroots opinions and sensitivities. As a part of submitting public comments regarding the Royal Pines Apartments I have copied both Logan and Steve.

I will eventually communicate with the Mayor's office and City Council as well outlining my concerns.

In closing, please be mindful of my other questions particularly in the financial accountability areas. I already have calls into the appropriate city staff on some of these. If you have any helpful information please feel free to forward. I would really like to see the total dollars the city has received in the housing area over the last 10 years and look at just where it has been spent. After living here for 15 years I can tell you a lot of money may have been spent Downtown at the expense of other areas of the city that are in need—// another discussion for another day!

Thanks again for all you do.

Look forward to meeting all of you face to face at some point down the road.

Jim

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 20, 2023, at 8:01 AM, Sunderlin, Katie <Katie.Sunderlin@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Hi, Jim,

Steve is out the rest of this week but, you can find the public participation within this PDF beginning on page 54.

<https://coloradosprings.gov/document/homecos20200608.pdf>

Thanks,

Katie Sunderlin, Architect, LEED AP BD+C

Senior Affordable Housing Coordinator
Housing and Community Vitality Department
Office: 719-385-5345
Cell: 719-238-6257
Katie.Sunderlin@coloradosprings.gov



From: Jim Blair <froggyamate@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2023 6:08 PM
To: Posey, Steve <Steve.Posey@coloradosprings.gov>
Cc: Robertson, Holly L <Holly.Robertson@coloradosprings.gov>; Sunderlin, Katie <Katie.Sunderlin@coloradosprings.gov>
Subject: Re: Royal Pine Apartments

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!

Thanks Steve. I'll review to see if this info answers my questions particularly in the financial area and those identified in my preceding email on transparency, accountability, etc

As a friendly FYI, I am already getting a little push back at State and Federal level as it applies to just how much total money our area (including El Paso County) has received for housing.

Given the \$. Billions in the American Rescue Plan it's going to be interesting if folks try sending me down rabbit holes or actually provide me actual numbers.

Additionally, dollars identified for Affordable Housing being siphoned off by non-profits/NGO's is a big issue in DC and I guarantee we probably have our fair share here in town. Just a quick snippet of one of the other areas I'm sifting thru.

Finally, I'm canvassing local leaders up in the northern part of the city to determine who or what city departments queried, coordinated, or obtained info from local residents when the HomeCos and the Affordable Housing planning and strategy were being developed at the City Council district level.

From what I'm seeing everything has been done in a centralized city bureaucratic manner which has resulted in the response you're seeing from residents here in Pine Creek.

I've lived here for 15 years and I see a lot of hidden agendas within City Hall at every level. I don't recall any such outreach to local residents on on HomeCos and affordable housing in our area.

If I'm wrong please provide the staff person your department or Peter's staff that engaged with folks here in Pine Creek and the other close by neighborhoods.

Thanks again. If my previous questions are not answered via the links you have provided please have your staff continue getting me the answers I need.

Thanks much,
Jim

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 17, 2023, at 3:30 PM, Posey, Steve <Steve.Posey@coloradosprings.gov> wrote:

Jim:

Thank you for reaching out with questions about various affordable housing developments either underway or planned in our city. The developer for the apartment project on Interquest is Lincoln Avenue Capital. The point of contact for the project is Ben Taylor. (608) 347-6604.

In order to address your questions related to PAB financing, please see the list of FAQs attached to this email. For general info about the need for affordable housing in our region, particularly for residents earning less than the area median income, please use the link to our website.

[Affordable Housing | City of Colorado Springs](#)

In 2019, the Housing & Community Vitality Department completed "HomeCOS, Housing Our Future." The plan includes references to multiple studies that speak to the importance of housing that is well-aligned with local wages, housing that supports improved long-term outcomes for children, housing for seniors and others with fixed-incomes, and housing as a long-term response to chronic homelessness.

HomeCOS is consistent with the city's recently adopted long-range comprehensive plan available at the following link:

[Introduction: Vision and Big Ideas | City of Colorado Springs](#)

Housing For All is one of the 'Big Ideas' featured in PlanCOS which encourages development of a variety of housing types at all price points throughout our city.

Best,

Steve Posey
Chief Housing Officer
City of Colorado Springs, CO
719-385-6880

Hubble, Logan K

From: ptcarson@gmail.com
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2023 9:15 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: ptcarson@gmail.com; 'kris tunehorst'
Subject: Royal Pine Low Income Housing Project - Zoning

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 am writing, as a resident of Pine Creek, my strong opposition to the change in the zoning that the Colorado Springs planning department is conducting on Royal Pine.

The change in zoning is:

- Being done in secret and with express favoritism to create a taxpayer funded government subsidy to finance a private company to build apartments that don't make financial sense.
- It is destructive and detrimental to open space nearby.
- It is dangerous – there is simply not enough road capacity to handle the increased traffic.
- It was zoned for businesses and leaves access to those businesses limited.
- It is unsafe – with no egress except on Royal Pine which cannot handle the traffic load.
- It is unsafe – it will add traffic throughout Pine Creek and reduce pedestrian and road safety.
- It is unsafe – robberies and property crimes will increase – as my home was recently robbed and property crimes are not enforced in Colorado Springs now.
- It is unnecessary in this location – there are MANY other parcels of land that are available and safer.
- It is unnecessary – as the availability of low-cost older houses is available – and requires work to improve existing properties. Why build new – when repairing existing housing stock can work?
- It is undemocratic – ignoring most voters and citizens – in the area.

We citizens see this for what it is. A political maneuver to destroy suburban neighborhoods without regard to any voter or citizen input.

It is inappropriate to blatantly ignore all the citizens (the vast majority that oppose the project), for the sake of taking a political action to subsidize housing and give money to wealthy out of town builders who have no vested interest except to make money while destroying suburban neighborhoods nationwide.

Please stop this project.

Best Regards

Paul Carson
719.209.5279

Hubble, Logan K

From: sarah arnold <sarahhaberarnold@hotmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 18, 2023 4:22 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Appeal Royal Pine Apartments

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 Directors of Community Planning and Development,

As a community member of Pine Creek neighborhood, I request an appeal for the development of the Royal Pine Apartments. We are a military family that just moved from Hawaii this week and recently invested in our second home in Pine Creek neighborhood. We chose this neighborhood a second time to be apart of. Developing a 4 story apartment against a natural habitat would be devastating for the community and surrounding area. The increase in traffic, lack of planned parking available for tenants, and currently overcrowded schools do not make this an ideal corner for a four story high rise. We'd appreciate the support in respecting our community, the environment, and planning this for a more ideal location.

Regards,
Sarah Arnold

Sent from my iPhone

Hubble, Logan K

From: Stevo Parrish <armydad1972@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2023 11:05 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: PineCreek VillageNeighbors
Subject: DEPN-23-0141

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!

Logan,

The proposed development of 232 apartment units will be “detrimental to the public interest, health, safety, convenience or general welfare,” for the following reasons:

- 1) Traffic will significantly increase, creating a safety concern related to egress, and having a detrimental effect on Pine Creek residents due to noise, light, and inconvenience. To presume traffic will decrease discounts the fact that there is not currently the additional traffic of "potential future developments."
- 2) The increased pollution of noise, light, and waste (chemical and physical trash) will increase significantly, also being detrimental to current PCV residents' interest, health, safety, and general welfare. This will also impact the Wildlife Habitat Area adjacent to the property.
- 3) The development of 232 apartments and additional 630+ people will create congestion and parking concerns for the existing businesses, thereby impacting their businesses and patrons.
- 4) The existing area does not support apartment living, as getting to medical clinics, schools, and jobs will be difficult and time consuming for residents, and ultimately go against public interest, health, safety, convenience, and general welfare.
- 5) The existing plat was not designed to accommodate apartments from an infrastructure standpoint. This includes sewage, water, electric, telecommunications, and gas. The additional strain on the existing system will be detrimental to not only the City at large, but the local residents too. .

The City needs to deny this development plan and encourage the developer to move to another location, more suitable to apartments.

V/r
Steve Parrish
719-464-4220

Preserve Pine Creek, LLC

Hubble, Logan K

From: Stevo Parrish <armydad1972@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2023 9:32 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: PineCreek VillageNeighbors
Subject: Traffic Study DEPN-23-0141
Attachments: Royal Pine Apts TIS 7.3.23-Traffic Study.docx

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!

Logan,

Attached is the TIS and my comments are in blue on the document. Bottom line, this traffic "study" is biased and misleading, and it fails to account for surrounding traffic counts, specifically those from the Pine Creek Village Neighborhood. In addition, doing this for one day in the summer fails to account for school and normal work times. Lastly, traffic engineers acknowledge that traffic counts are not science and amount to guesses based on simple projections. They "calculate" based on guesses and not hard data, as highlighted by steps 2-7 of the trip generation model. This is an example of garbage, in, garbage out.

Do not accept this "study" as it is limited and appears biased in favor of the developer.

V/r

Steve Parrish
719-464-4220

Preserve Pine Creek, LLC.

Hubble, Logan K

From: Chriss Koch <ckoch61@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 17, 2023 7:03 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine Apartments

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,

I am a homeowner in Pine Creek and I am STRONGLY opposed to the proposed Royal Pine Apartments.

My house is at 9923 Red Sage Drive, and the backyard of my house would be directly facing the proposed apartments, making me one of those residents most directly affected if these apartments were to be constructed, due to the proximity to my home.

The proposed apartments do not offer anything of advantage to Pine Creek, and this is not a suitable location for low income apartments.

Sincerely,
Chriss G. Koch
9923 Red Sage Dr

Hubble, Logan K

From: Randy Howarth <randy_howarth@hotmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, July 16, 2023 9:31 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Cc: Randy Howarth
Subject: Record #: DEPN-23-0141 - Feedback on Royal Pine Apartment Project from Impacted Residents

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 Logan Hubble,

This was submitted by us yesterday for the concept plan but was advised to send regarding the DEPN-23-0141 development plan as well and to request it be included in the official record:

My wife Sandy and I live in Pine Creek and our home sits about 50 feet south of the proposed development on Royal Pine. We have lived in the home since 2015 and have made substantial improvements to the home during this time. We are retired and on a fixed income and have major concerns for the proposed project. Specifically:

1. Putting **4 story buildings next to primarily one story residential homes** (ours and our immediate neighbors) and some nearby 2 story homes makes no sense. There has been no thought into the aesthetics – just a plan to cram as many units into a small space as possible to make money for the developer. Having 4 story units looking into our yard and home is inappropriate. If the units are going to be 4 stories, that should only be up against Powers and not near residential areas which should be limited to 2 stories.
2. **Traffic issues** – there is **only one entrance to the Pine Creek neighborhood** near Union and Royal Pine with all vehicles required to go through a roundabout and zero on street parking. The addition of 232 units will add at least 350 vehicles plus guests of tenants, causing considerable traffic congestion, and additional accidents which are already a problem in this area. In addition – emergency services already have difficulty on this section of Royal Pine and the round about. The fires department has stated that they would need to get 3 ladder trucks into this area quickly for any fire in the apartments or adjoining businesses. Currently that would be impossible with tenants fleeing the area and only one available entry/exit. CDOT will not allow an additional entrance from Union to the proposed development, so there is not a viable solution.
3. **Parking** – the proposal shows 309 parking spaces for 232 apartments that include 364 bedrooms. Even modest estimates for vehicles exceed the planned spaces and do not include visitors to tenants. **The greatest overflow impact will be on the next door businesses – Vet Clinic, Dental Office and the OB/Gyn office who will have people parking in their business areas. Secondly, the only other place to park is in the Pine Creek – Orchard Park neighborhood.** There is already very limited street parking available for residents and the HOA is consistently trying to get cars off of the streets.
4. **Wildlife Habitat area** – this proposed development is next to a protected Wildlife Habitat area which has a healthy number of animals from mountain lions, bobcats, coyotes, foxes, and an occasional deer/elk sightings – not to mention large numbers of smaller animals including the protected Preble mouse. Adding this many units with children of all ages will be next to impossible to protect this area – especially with limited options for them to expend energy nearby outdoors.

5. **Noise / Light Pollution** – our home, again, is 50 feet from the development property and the noise levels from hundreds of additional cars and the required lighting for the proposed complex will negatively impact our ability to sleep and to live comfortably in our home.

At the recent community meeting with the developer and city representatives, it was telling when the developer was asked what it would take for the project not to happen and he said 'It's way past that option – we've been working with the city for years and it is going to happen one way or the other.'

Steve Posey was asked the same question separately and he stated that it was still in the early stages of the process and anything could happen.

There is a good reason why the larger Pine Creek Neighborhood is against this project – not just us who are impacted the most directly next door. The lack of transparency, the attempt to put in an inordinate amount of units in this space and the seeming effort to push through the developer's wishes without respect for the local constituents needs/desires has bonded us together to resist this in every way possible – and for the long haul.

We believe that this is more than a Pine Creek issue but an issue that needs to be addressed for the city of Colorado Springs at large, before we negatively impact the city we love to call home.

When we purchased our home 8 years ago, we were told that the commercial development of the property would be medical offices such as the 1-2 story ones there now. Those are great neighbors – low impact – regular business hours and fit in will with the existing neighborhood. This proposed apartments are just the opposite.

My wife and I ask that our requests/concerns and those of our neighbors be listened to and that this proposed project not be allowed to be built as currently planned.

Best regards,
Randy and Sandra Howarth
4276 Apple Hill Ct.
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

(719) 602-3796
randyhowarth7@gmail.com

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

Hubble, Logan K

From: Ann Kumm <akummco1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 14, 2023 3:26 PM
To: Donelson, Dave; Helms, Randy; Talarico, Michelle; Crow-Iverson, Lynette; Avila, Yolanda; Henjum, Nancy; Mike.OMalley@coloradosprings.go; david.leinweber@coloradosprings.go; brian.riskey@coloradosprings.go; egrodahl@dbgpropertiesllc.com; Yemi Mobolade; Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pine apartments
Attachments: Madison, WI developments.html

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 Mayor, Councilors, City staff, and Mr. Grodahl,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed Royal Pine apartments. The proposed location is bad for many reasons. The major issues of concern fall into traffic and accessibility, public safety and proximity to the open, natural space.

1. Traffic and Accessibility

A. Union Boulevard at that corner is high traffic and high speed, especially since it now brings in Black Forest traffic on a thru basis. The proximity to Target, Lowe's, Memorial and Children's Hospitals, and Lifetime Fitness add to the traffic. And don't forget about adding in future traffic from whatever gets built on remaining hospital property.

B. Powers Boulevard traffic exiting southbound at Union and heading west routinely speeds into all available lanes of Union.

C. I routinely see drivers exiting the hospital complex from Union then doing a u-turn at the Royal Pine/Union intersection. Factor that into potential for trouble with increased traffic.

D. The ingress and egress at the proposed site, for approximately 300+ cars, is insufficient. Royal Pine becomes one-lane shortly after the stoplight, and the roundabout is too narrow for the traffic generated by an apartment complex. It will be a burden for existing Pine Creek residents.

E. Mountain Metro access is very limited in this area. There is one stop at the hospital, but riders would have to transfer to one or more buses to go anywhere beyond Academy Boulevard.

F. Royal Pine has a dedicated bike lane, which is used by both commuters and recreational cyclists. This end of the city has lost, not gained, access to safe biking routes (e.g. Old Ranch Road not improved to include bike lanes, Voyager Parkway has plenty of room for dedicated bike lanes but some genius decided that placing random curb structures jutting out into traffic was a better use of real estate???, and city residents just wouldn't give up their 55-60mph driving (in 45mph zones) to allow for bike lanes on Research Parkway a few years back. THE POINT IS, THIS IS A VERY CAR-CENTRIC PART OF THE CITY AND LOW INCOME RESIDENTS WHO RELY ON ALTERNATIVE FORMS OF TRANSPORTATION WILL BE OUT OF LUCK.

G. As an avid cyclist and frequent walker in this area, I can attest to the difficulty of crossing the busy intersections at Royal Pine, Union Boulevard and Briargate Parkway (all of them). Even with the walking signals, I routinely have cars turn past me as I cross, and I take all precautions. Imagine a young parent with a stroller or children doing this regularly...the risk rises.

H. Of the eight or so D-20 schools within a five-mile radius, almost all have at least one portable classroom...in several cases they have four. This tells me schools are full.

I. We know that busing has been greatly reduced for D-20, and residents of the proposed apartments, if they had to walk to school would be crossing multiple very busy intersections regardless of which direction they headed.

Public Safety

A. The city's growth has already put an extreme burden on our police and fire coverage.

I rarely see police in the area, with the exception of when they have to stop at the hospital complex. This is a shortage that will not soon catch up with the pace of growth in this area, even with the proposed police academy. And let me add, I did not fight my recent home assessment as I believe the city needs our taxes now more than ever to improve fire and police access.

B. Auto break-ins and theft are rampant in the city, especially at apartment complexes.

Sadly, while many renters are good residents, way too many don't have any "skin in the game" or a sense of community pride and ownership. Speeding, noise, trash and property crime follow.

C. The upper Pine Creek neighborhood has few options for entering and leaving, and adding another 16% of the total number of Pine Creek households at one of those ingress/egress locations is of great concern not only for daily work commuting, but also in a potential wildfire situation.

D. The proposed apartment complex does not appear to have sufficient parking (see car-centric comment above), so this of course means that residents and guests would park on the closest neighborhood streets. This will not make for friendly neighbor interactions and also creates more opportunity for car break-ins and theft in our neighborhood.

Open Space

D. Consider the adjacent wild, open space as a potential public safety issue: children and loose pets wandering in could result in injury or death due to wild animal interactions or drowning in the runoff basins, and errant combustibles could result in a dangerous wild fire (our winds up here are real!).

E. The effect on wildlife must be considered. Mule Deer, coyotes, hawks, owls, and bobcats are very common in the open space. Racoons, skunks and eagles are not seen as frequently but are there as well. I have seen 4-6 elk on numerous occasions over the past three years (including crossing Royal Pine and heading up to the proposed apartment lot).

E. One of this city's best assets are its protected open spaces. It benefits residents and most certainly benefits the wildlife and plant life within. IT NEEDS TO BE PRESERVED!

Pine Creek as a neighborhood doesn't have any splashy waterfalls, parks or features. The natural feel of the neighborhood has been intentional from the start and it is what makes it unique and desireable. DON'T RUIN IT FOR US!

In general, I don't understand why a non-local, out-of-state developer is first in consideration for a project like this. I have attached an article from Madison, WI on problems they are facing in two similar situations. I don't believe DBG Properties fully understands this particular location and its limitations and drawbacks. They are looking for an easy build with a minimum of effort, and that doesn't sit well with the overwhelming majority of Pine Creek residents. Mayor Mobolade was elected by many of us (myself included) to counteract the too-cozy relationship with rampant development. Personally, I believe the Powers Boulevard corridor is the worst urban sprawl in Colorado. Every major intersection, in addition to being dangerous, looks like the next/last...fast food, car washes, strip malls, NEW APARTMENT COMPLEX AFTER NEW APARTMENT COMPLEX and all with no attention to beautification or improvement from the city. I avoid it like the plague!

Finally, I have attached an article from Madison, WI on problems that the city is facing with two recent low-income housing projects, both of which were built and are managed by out of state developers. I came across the article because I lived in Madison for five years in the 80s and still follow headlines there. I think it is wise to be cautious in considering non-local entities for development. They have one goal and that is to increase their bottom line.

Respectfully,

Ann Kumm

3714 Palazzo Grove

Colorado Springs, CO 80920

Hubble, Logan K

From: Sarah Markham <secmarkham@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, July 8, 2023 1:45 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments

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!

Sent from my iPhone

Hubble, Logan K

From: Pankaj Vispute <pankaj.vispute@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, July 4, 2023 6:00 PM
To: Posey, Steve; Hubble, Logan K; Helms, Randy; Yemi Mobolade
Subject: Opposition to Low-Income Housing Development near - Pine Creek and Orchard Trail Park area.

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 Steve, Logan, Randy, Mayor Yemi,

I hope this letter finds you in good health and high spirits. I am writing to express my deep concerns and opposition to the proposed low-income housing development near my residence at Pine Creek (Orchard Park). While I understand the importance of providing affordable housing opportunities within our community, I believe that the current proposed location is unsuitable and will have adverse effects on the neighborhood and its residents. I kindly request you to reconsider this decision for the following reasons:

- 1. Decreased Property Values:** The introduction of low-income housing in close proximity to my residence and other neighboring properties may have a detrimental impact on property values. Potential buyers and current homeowners might be deterred by the perception of increased crime rates or a decrease in the overall desirability of the area. This could lead to financial hardships for homeowners who have invested their savings and effort into creating a safe and comfortable environment for their families.
- 2. Traffic and Parking Issues:** The proposed housing development may exacerbate existing traffic congestion issues in our neighborhood. The increased population density could strain the already limited parking options available, leading to an influx of parked vehicles on streets, causing inconvenience for residents and creating potential safety hazards. Moreover, the heightened traffic flow may disrupt the peaceful ambiance of the area and compromise the safety of pedestrians and children.
- 3. Strain on Infrastructure:** Our neighborhood's existing infrastructure, including schools, healthcare facilities, and public services, may not be adequately equipped to handle the additional demands resulting from a new housing development. The strain on these resources could lead to a decline in the quality and accessibility of essential services, negatively impacting the overall well-being of residents.
- 4. Safety Concerns:** While I firmly believe in providing affordable housing for all members of our community, it is essential to consider the safety implications associated with the proposed low-income housing development. Without proper screening and background checks, there is a potential risk of increasing crime rates and a disruption of the tranquil environment in which we currently reside. I fear that this may compromise the safety and security of our neighborhood, posing a threat to the well-being of residents.
- 5. Environmental Impact:** The construction of a housing development near my residence raises concerns about the potential environmental impact. Destruction of natural habitats, deforestation, and increased noise pollution during the construction phase may harm local ecosystems and wildlife. Furthermore, the increased water and energy usage by the additional residents could strain our already limited resources, affecting the ecological balance of the area.

I genuinely understand the need for affordable housing within our community and support initiatives that aim to address this issue. However, I firmly believe that the proposed location near my residence is not appropriate and may have adverse consequences for the existing residents. I kindly request you to reconsider this decision and explore alternative locations that can accommodate the low-income housing development without negatively impacting our

neighborhood.

I would be grateful for the opportunity to further discuss my concerns with you or any other relevant city council members. I am open to constructive dialogue and collaborating on finding alternative solutions that satisfy the need for affordable housing while preserving the integrity and quality of life within our community.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I appreciate your efforts in considering the concerns of your constituents.

Sincerely,
Pankaj Vispute

Hubble, Logan K

From: Donna Banks <dybanks@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 3, 2023 7:52 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments
Attachments: apartments.docx

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 Hubble,

I am a resident of Pine Creek. I have attached a WORD document with my input regarding the proposed building of apartments.

Thank you for taking the time to read my document.

Donna Banks

Hubble, Logan K

From: JACKIE HAMARA <jalhamra@comcast.net>
Sent: Monday, July 3, 2023 10:42 AM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Comments and concerns over the proposed "affordable apartments" in Pine Creek

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. Hubble,

I have lived in Pine Creek since 2001 with my husband Rami and my three children. When we chose Pine Creek the builder and developed assured us it was a wonderful place to live, that D20 was the best school district and that our backyard and area would be private and protected because of the endangered Preble jumping mouse. We have enjoyed living in Pine Creek and all three of our children were raised in Pine Creek and they all graduated from Pine Creek High School.

I am concerned about this "affordable housing apartment complex". First of all I have nothing against people who can't afford 500,000+ homes and feel for the lower social economic class. I myself work in school district 38 as a SPED para and I know how significantly low the salaries are for classified and certified teachers. D38 pays the teachers the lowest salaries in the state of Colorado. Without my husband's income I too would be in that category of low income. I feel for the single parents, teachers, paras, nurses, EMTs, and service industry workers. I just don't think this is the right place to build said apartment complex, particularly a four story high one. This will increase traffic problems, and the apartment tenants will not have enough parking spaces. 309 parking spots is not enough parking for 232 units. The apartment tenants will be parking all over the neighborhood in front of people's homes. If they start parking in front of my house I will be calling the tow truck and have it towed. District 20 will become overcrowded because they have a "choice window" and allow students to choose into the district that don't live in D20. D20 is already struggling to fill all the teacher positions not to mention an increased need for more bus routes and bus drivers which are very difficult positions to fill. This will ultimately be urban sprawl and we have wildlife areas and a protected habitat to protect the animals that live there. If bus drivers are not hired children will be being driven by parents, walking or riding their bikes to school. This negatively impacts the safety of the children and accidents will occur more frequently with the increased number of drivers on the road in the morning increasing congestion and traffic jams. Childcare in the area is limited as Primrose day care was shut down and there is only so many children that can attend the before and after "day care" at schools and not all the schools in D20 offer the before and after care for the students who need it.

The increased population will create negative impacts including water and air pollution and endanger further the Preble mouse and protected wildlife habits in the area. We shouldn't allow an out of state investor from Oregon to come in and buy the area just to get richer. This isn't about him trying to provide apartments for the economically disadvantaged because he will inevitably raise their rent. Or is he such a good, pious, perfect Christian who will never raise their rent-uh no way! This is about a rich investor honing into our peaceful, quiet community and padding his pocketbook to get richer without taking into consideration all the negative effects it will have on our current community living here. It will cause chaos and disruption, increase traffic difficulties, pollution to the water and air, and crime will increase with the increased people. This is an arrogant, selfish person thinking about his own bottom line which is getting richer.

We adamantly oppose this development and need to see it shut down. It also makes us watch and take notice of the people who are supportive and helpful to us when making decisions in the elections.

Sincerely,

Jackie Alhamra

Hubble, Logan K

From: Holly Lawrence <honorville@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 29, 2023 4:42 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments Objection
Attachments: Pine Creek Apartment Letter.docx

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!

Letter attached

Holly Lawrence

Hubble, Logan K

From: Steve White <swwhite1462@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 29, 2023 4:14 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Low income housing project

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!

The low income housing project proposed for Royal Pine and Union is a terrible idea. An additional 242 families at that location will be a hardship on the existing families in the neighborhood. We strongly oppose the construction of this project.

Steve & Lori White
3474 Limber Pine Ct

Hubble, Logan K

From: Jeff Brooks <pikespeakhiker@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 27, 2023 12:17 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Re: Apartments on Royal Pine

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. Hubble-

My name is Jeff Brooks. My wife, Jennifer, and I have lived in Pine Creek for almost 20 years. When we moved in, we did our due diligence. We understand the master plan. We understood that Powers would be upgraded to a major high speed highway near our neighborhood.

But we never expected that a dense apartment complex would be built in an area that we use for recreation often on the sidewalks. And it is disappointing that the city would allow it to happen when there is so much other land available.

We also worked extremely hard to own our home. And we do not want the increased traffic coming through our neighborhood to get to schools on Chapel Hills drive.

As well, the developer provided misleading data on the impact to home prices. He used a poor baseline of zip code. Of course a single apartment complex will not change the housing prices meaningful across a massive zip code like 80920. But i bet it will within 1000 feet and within a mile or so, meaning most of Pine Creek. As this moves forward, I would hope that the developer would be required to provide that level of data from past projects.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best regards,
Jeff

Hubble, Logan K

From: sclanning <sclanning@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, June 13, 2023 7:49 AM
To: Helms, Randy; All Council - DL
Cc: Posey, Steve; Hubble, Logan K
Subject: MUST-READ: "I'm from the Government and I'm here to Help"

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:

City Council President Randy Helms, District 2
Council President Pro Tem Lynette Crow-Iverson, At-Large Representative
Councilmember Dave Donelson, District 1
Councilmember Michelle Talarico, District 3
Councilmember Yolanda Avila, District 4
Councilmember Nancy Henjum, District 5
Councilmember Mike O'Malley, District 6
Councilmember David Leinweber, At-Large Representative
Councilmember Brian Risley, At-Large Representative
The Gazette
KVOR 740
KKTV 11 News
KOAA News 5
FOX21 News
KRDO 13 News
District Director, U.S. Congressman for the Colorado 5th Congressional District
Chairman, El Paso County GOP
Vice Chairman, El Paso County GOP
Colorado Representative for House District 14
Colorado Senator for District 9

SUBJECT: "I'm from the Government and I'm here to Help"

The Pine Creek Village (PCV) Community of Colorado Springs has learned through one media report that the "City of Colorado Springs plans to issue up to \$40 million in private activity bonds to build more than 200 new affordable rental housing units" to include "a number of very low-income units" in our neighborhood. "The Royal Pines Apartments, as they are currently known will include 232 one-, two-, and three-bedroom units."

Many PCV homeowners feel there has been a general lack of transparency in basic areas of concern, which are listed below. Moreover, a lot of us are concerned that the City Council is fast-tracking the effort and expects to consider a resolution declaring the city's intention to issue the bonds pending the development plan's approval, at its upcoming meeting on June 13th.

Our countless neighbors believe strongly in preserving the "American Dream" of home ownership and pushing

back on existential threats to the suburban way of life that will bring lower home prices and incur other costs related to the economy, the environment, and safety. As such, we find the blueprint for proceeding with the Royal Pines Apartment Complex, which seems to be an increasing trend in Colorado Springs ... unacceptable!

Therefore, a large number of PCV residents insist that the City Council suspend its action to declare its intention to issue the bonds until we all receive assurances on the following very basic areas of concern. We'll end with a rhetorical question: why has the media chosen to **not** investigate and report on the people's side of the story?

Preliminary Areas of Concern

1. Colorado Springs City Website Link (2017 Affordable Rental Housing Program & Underwriting Guidelines). Is it current and in accordance with current Federal and State Policies and Regulations? As this project is hoping to receive \$40M of public financing, how is the proposed actual AMI breakdown supportive of true affordability?
2. Timeline. Have you shared the timeline in a public and accessible manner?
3. Communication. What is the standard practice of communication throughout this process? Why will only PCV residents within 1,000 feet receive a postcard about this development?
4. Land Use. How did the City of Colorado Springs determine that this land should be mixed-use neighborhood, and not remain professional business complex? How did this housing developer know that he could use this land for apartments? Did the city consult the current businesses to determine their concerns/needs? As City Council approved the 130% CSU water threshold in January 2023, how does the City rationalize new development in favor of the redevelopment of currently existing housing?
5. Market Analysis, Plan, & Study. Has there been an analysis, plan, and study? If so, by whom? If not, when? Aside from the June 13th City Council meeting, did you include PCV residents or the existing businesses? When will you publish the results and disseminate it to residents and businesses for review and comment? How will you address any concerns?
6. Residents. How will the developer verify residents' income level?
7. Housing Designation. What is the housing designation? Permanent, permanent supportive, special needs, homeless relocation, transitional, senior?
8. Maintenance and Management of Housing. Who is responsible? GSL Properties. Who funds?
9. Funding. Walk thru all aspects of the funding requirements. How does the City intend to fund other impacts due to this development (school buses, road expansion, environmental protection, etc.)?
10. Appraisal. Does the property have a current appraisal? If so, by who and at what value?
11. Environmental Impact Study. Traffic, Noise, Light, Pollution (83 & Dust), and impact to the existing wildlife habitat area. Preble Prairie Jumping Mouse?
12. Resident Accountability. Lifestyle, Terms for Eviction?
13. Parking. Will there be enough parking for residents and visitors? How will the City ensure parking does not overflow onto the businesses and streets of PCV?
14. Traffic. The current streets through PCV are two lane and have limited egress. How will you address this? Bus System-What would the timeline and costs be for the extension and increased service of bus service to the proposed project area? This includes the construction of bus stops, increased mileage, increased hiring etc. Bicycling-What would the timeline and costs be for the extension and increased service of bicycling infrastructure for the proposed project area? Emergency Evacuation-How will the proposed project address rapid egress in emergency situations (Boulder, CO)?
15. Long-term Costs. Although funded through private activity bonds, are there future costs to tax payers for traffic mitigation, safety, egress, etc.?
16. Safety. How will the developer maintain safety for the apartment complex's resident children, where it will abut to Union and Powers BLVDs (both six lane, high speed roads)?

Sent from my Galaxy Tab A

Sent from my T-Mobile 4G LTE Device

Hubble, Logan K

From: Jessica Provost <jessica_g_provost@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 30, 2023 12:08 PM
To: Posey, Steve; Hubble, Logan K
Cc: Helms, Randy; Friedman, Samuel
Subject: Royal Pines Apartments 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!

Dear City Officials,

I hope this email finds you in good health and high spirits. My name is Jessica Provost, and I am writing to express my deep concerns regarding the proposed low-income housing project in close proximity to my residence, 3583 Oak Meadow Drive. As an engaged and concerned resident, I firmly believe it is essential to address potential issues that could significantly impact our neighborhood.

Firstly, I want to emphasize that I fully support the idea of providing affordable housing opportunities for those in need. The importance of creating an inclusive and diverse community cannot be overstated. However, I believe there are valid reasons to reconsider the specific location of the proposed low-income housing project, and I would like to outline these concerns for your consideration:

Density and Infrastructure: The proposed project appears to have a significantly higher density than the existing residential area. This raises concerns about strain on the infrastructure, such as increased traffic congestion, limited parking availability, and potential overcrowding of local schools, parks, and public amenities. These issues could negatively impact the quality of life for both existing residents and future low-income housing occupants.

Property Values: While I understand the importance of affordable housing initiatives, the proximity of a low-income housing project may potentially affect property values in the neighborhood. This could have a lasting impact on homeowners who have made significant investments in their properties and rely on the value of their homes for financial stability.

Safety and Security: It is crucial to consider the safety and security implications associated with a high-density housing project. There is a legitimate concern that an increased population density may contribute to a higher crime rate, as well as put additional strain on emergency services. The wellbeing of residents, both current and prospective, should be a priority when evaluating the suitability of a housing development.

Environmental Impact: It is important to assess the potential environmental impact of the proposed project. Factors such as increased waste generation, strain on local resources, and additional energy consumption should be thoroughly considered and mitigated to ensure sustainable development.

Given these concerns, I kindly request that the City Council consider alternative locations that may be more suitable for the proposed low-income housing project. This would allow for a fair and equitable distribution of affordable housing across the city without disproportionately impacting a single neighborhood.

Additionally, I would like to propose a community engagement process to facilitate dialogue between the City Council, residents, and other stakeholders. By fostering open communication and providing opportunities for input from all parties involved, we can collectively work towards finding a solution that meets the needs of both the community and those in need of affordable housing.

I appreciate your time and attention to this matter. As a resident who deeply cares about the well-being of our neighborhood, I urge you to take these concerns into consideration when making decisions regarding the proposed low-income housing project. I look forward to a thoughtful and considerate evaluation of this matter.

Thank you for your service to our community.

Sincerely,

Jessica Provost
3583 Oak Meadow Dr
Colorado Springs, CO 80920

Hubble, Logan K

From: Kristin Knipp <kpinky84@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 24, 2023 5:07 PM
To: Hubble, Logan K
Subject: Union/Royal Pine "Affordable" complex

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 this email in concern with the proposed "affordable" complex off Union and Royal Pine. This community has worked hard to ensure our neighborhoods are safe and low crime. If this complex is approved, it not only depletes our neighborhoods but our property values. Let alone, our safety. As a native of Colorado Springs, I have seen first hand how "affordable" complexes ruin neighborhoods. This is a safety risk!

I am in petition of this and would like more information about this.

Thank you

Kristin Knipp
719-310-5735