

Baxter, Tamara

From: Mitchell Schutz <ultra.classic@aol.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2024 4:05 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Anex-23-0016

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
What is going on this site and if this is no.2 what was no.1 and what is going on no.1? If it's more dam apartments then no to all of it. They are being over built and the fill rate is pretty dam low.

Mitchell Schutz

Sent from my iPad

Baxter, Tamara

From: charles newman <amerdrm2009@live.com>
Sent: Friday, February 9, 2024 8:39 PM
To: Baxter, Tamara
Subject: Brass-Oliver Annexation No. 2 proposal

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

Good afternoon, this is Charles Newman owner of the property directly West of your proposed annex into Colorado Springs, Colorado.

In order to obtain my approval of said request for change in property zoning I would also like to be included in change of use as annexing takes away my rights to well and septic uses in future one way or another. Furthermore reducing the value and use of my well maintained and Single family perse use of my property which held business and Community free area for El Paso county, business owners and general public to dispose of Mountain Pine Beetle Infested trunk wood for over a decade prior and call naturally to Urban Firewood renting said property and holding no responsibilities to Foxtrot Rd during its use and fence line busting, over use of area outside said property borders, traffic so and so forth.

That said I know annexing both properties adds value to all interested parties in doing so and reduces future wonderments of use for the whole area. To only include one is a favor for one and the city to clearly gain advantage over all in this bordering area of said property.

I had a buyer as of a week ago (seeking same use types) who wanted to purchase my land for Commercial use for a rather large Landscape company Turf Master (reference "EA 2411") to establish and create an excellent place for doing business as the area has decades of homes and building going on around it, which we knew in 1994 when I purchased together with my folks. RR-3 zoned at time of purchase. Was set as a business and home from the start clearly regranted and clarified in 2012 meeting over changing use from Landscape and Forestry to trailer storage without approval because I was changing business type use of my property. Understood and granted with a probable rezone for storage buildings at same time and date.

Long story short Yes if included in rezoning along with said property same zoning multi use and residential *investors may wanna do townhouses perse. or the written right to keep well and septic system indefinitely and replaceable on my property without ever having to hook up to city of Colorado Springs and/or any other entity in time unless bought for other uses such as townhouses and best practices at time.

Meaning if it either goes out future owner(s) have rights to fix and/or replace, or option to tie into city.

Grew up as a Military child, teen and into my adulthood here in the Springs and County. When purchasing this land we knew Woodmen is the only true throughway through the Colorado Springs and best place to invest time and money was this/my property here now, will and has as growth significantly over time which would bring the actual true "land" value up for my and my childrens futures too.

For= if 6725 foxtrot In included for same uses and annexed in.

Totally against if not, annex not needed benefits whom and for what?

Not clarifying they are not wasting time and money to pursue thier dreams. The land buyer to prosper his business plan while allowing another bordering property requesting the same type use is an issue.

Most likely just timing as Mr. Letke suggested Annexing route, check with City. At time the purchasing prospect needed clarification that it's highly likely or close to it for time was a virtue in their being transitioned from June move out and into. Lease I presume or they sold, unknowns to me.

My concern is its a one way ticket for one property and city to claim all lands to be annexed in at any time in the future which steals my rights as a RR-3 grandfathered use of my property at time of its purchase in 1994 without clauses.

I prefer to move obviously as my place is for sell prior to this notice. Have drams beyond this place too.

In conclusion fir now, a wider spectrum of properties as well as the city and county would benefit from adding mine and any others whom border said property as a overall inclusion to what will become/stay as little enclaves of rural county fire and police(sheriff) districts, creates issues for all involved.

Best interest in the long haul would to be annexing all property up to Foxtrot Dr. a unified area larger than just the rectangle or small one said lot annexing. West of Foxtrot Dr. Is unknown.

My first thoughts on this new prospective being looked into.

I too am ready to prosper from an excellent land venture made in 1994. Not your enemy, I am just another prospering American in an excellent State.

America, land of prosperity and opportunity

American Dreamscapes LLC/Retired 🏠

Charles Newman

6725 Foxtrot Ln.

Colorado Springs, Colorado

80924

Be well.