

Sandy Vossler

From: Caroline Douglas <aspengrovesalon@me.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 18, 2015 2:48 PM
To: Sandy Vossler
Subject: Auburn Ridge phase 2

Sandy,

I believe the developers have proposed a completely different set of plans for the site behind my house. I went to the the first few "neighborhood meetings" where as I believed the following was proposed-

- Single story individual units
- grading down from our property so sight line was lower.
- age restriction 55 years and older
- buffer zone with road and trees directly behind our house.
- regularly priced homes.

Now the proposal as far I'm aware is,

- 2 story homes
- grading has changed so now all our view will be obstructed and they will be now looking in our bedroom window and indeed every window.
- no age restriction
- low income housing.

Everything that was discussed at the local meetings was a complete misrepresentation and in fact lies. They have no care for the existing neighborhood as the proposals will dramatically change the value of our homes, cause major noise and privacy issues. We already have section 8 housing across the street and now this development will attract more criminal activity and disharmony to our neighborhood. Our house was broken into 4 years ago, everything was taken. I have bars on the basement windows and doors already. With this proposal and the people it will attract, (not politically correct but it is truthful that lower income housing statistically has higher crime rate), I feel I need a 15 ft fence with wire coils on top.!

Having no buffer and no trees as promised combined with now 2 stories will mean the neighbors can seen directly in every window and our back yard.

This cannot be allowed.

The original proposals were bearable if the age restriction is in place with buffer and trees etc.

This current proposal is frankly appalling.

Caroline Douglas

Sandy Vossler

From: Jonathan Douglas <douglasdadof7@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, January 18, 2015 9:10 PM
To: Sandy Vossler
Cc: kbracken@medassets.com
Subject: Auburn Ridge

Ms. Vossler,

This email is in regards to the Auburn phase II proposal. I live at 1501 Millbrook Ct. I have come into your office a couple of times about this but have only met you once. Atlantic has made an art of the "bait and switch". What Ms Vreen proposed over a year ago is no where near what they are trying to push through. It sickens me that they make promises, trying to sound that they are have everyone in their best interest, but ultimately prove that they have nothing more than profit as a motivator. As a business owner, I understand and respect the idea of a profitable plan, but not on the foundation of lies and manipulation. My guess that the plan that they are trying to push through isn't even the plan they really expect to get... I think it's a smoke screen. They are looking to have passed something in between what the first proposal they made to their neighbors (my family) and this horribly misguided proposal. My guess is that they have plan C already drawn. It's a magician's trick that works on many business levels. It's not illegal or necessarily immoral but I don't like being played as a fool.

This development is at the entry of our entire community... Section 8 on one side and even lower priced apartments are the two pillars to the gate of our community. Not good. I don't mind the small homes they first proposed for 55 and older, that is graded lower and a large buffer between our homes and the new development. This new proposal is the exact opposite and is so lopsided, it has to be a semi bluff. It doesn't make sense as they can't possibly think that they would get our buy in and your approval for something so incredibly audacious. Can they be punished for assuming our community and your office is so dim? How about only allowing them to build a park. Rezone the whole area to a large community park. They want to rezone it... let's play their game... Threaten them with going the opposite way. Let's call their bluff and renegotiate as they are trying to do.

One consideration... Our property values WILL go down with this development. My property will be less attractive to a potential buyer with any development behind my house rather than open space. Will our community get an immediate revalue on our property taxes?

Please play their game more aggressively than they are trying to play theirs.

Please notify me directly of any planning meeting regarding this development.

Jonathan Douglas

Sandy Vossler

From: Tabatha Bollig <tabatha_bollig@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2015 11:10 PM
To: Sandy Vossler; kbracken@medassets.com; Jason Bollig
Subject: Auburn Ridge
Attachments: photo 1.JPG; photo2 1 (5).JPG; photo 21.JPG; img1201.jpg

Hi Sandy, Please add my comments below for the phase 2 development of Auburn Ridge

I live at 1470 Millbrook Court, Castle Rock Co. My name is Tabatha Bollig. I feel so miss lead with the developer of Auburn Ridge. What is there now is a complete eyesore. Taken away from the prettiness of our area and the uniqueness why we bought here in the 1st place. Allot they promised was not done and lists below in a statement.

The Story: The developer was seeking the neighborhoods support, and the council's approval to build higher than the two stories the property was zoned for. Our neighborhood was very supportive of allowing the developer, to build the additional story and not cause waves with the city Council. They sold us on two ideas: One, based on the phase 2 plan and that they would keep the buildings back from our property lines. The foundation was to be 80 feet from the property line. There were several proposals that were talked about for buffer zones between the property lines. Such as a dog park, a road, parking, and the buildings would be set back from our property lines so they would not obstruct our views intrusively. Two, was that they would dig phase 1 the three-story building, down lower and not increase site line more than what the two-story building would have. This is not true. Please see the attached. Developer, "We want to integrate into your neighborhood and add value and not just put a building right up to your property lines."

The Real Story: The sightlines from the homes are very intrusive. We now have an additional story that's intruding our site line. The developer built the foundation up, not down, please see the attached pictures vs the provided sight line. Once the phase 1 additional story and building is in place, phase 2 with the promises of buffer zones and appropriate distance from our homes has now been revamped. The entire platform that the developer asked for support and consideration has been removed. Once they gained their additional story and approval through city Council in support of the neighborhood the entire phase 2 project integration into the neighborhood was revamped. None of the promises that were made during our neighborhood meetings in relation to phase 2 have been followed through with, in the current proposal.

Original Phase 2: The original phase 2 had an 80 foot buffer for my property line. As mentioned above, the developer so that there would be a parking lot, dog park, road that would buffer the property line.

Current phase 2: The current proposed phase 2 foundation is 40 feet from my property line. That is only nine feet wider than my small backyard. The second story window from my home looks directly at the middle of the apartment complexes roof. Please see the attached architectural graphic of the sightlines from the second story window of the boring residents, which was provided from the developer. Please see attached

The sell - 55 and older: "These are going to be quiet neighbors but 55 and older and younger people will not want to live in this facility. We're going to keep the average price around \$800 younger people are not going to want to live in these type of facilities and they're not designed in that fashion."

The real story 55 and older: The developer wants to remove the age limitations and theme of the building is completely opposite of what was sold to the neighborhood and the Council. Developer wants no age restriction is my understanding. The average single unit is \$500 per month. The section 8 housing across the street has higher prices than what they're offering. I am supportive of affordable housing for seniors, but I also don't want low income housing boring my property and potentially decreasing my home's value.

In my opinion, this developer has strategically used the enticement of the neighborhood to gain speed, support, for their project on false pretenses. None, of the proposed benefits to integrate into Castle Highlands have been followed through with on their current proposal for phase 2. I believe this developer has told the Council, Castle Highlands what they wanted to hear to gain profit and a footprint in Castle rock. The developer has boasted about their ability to maintain and hold the properties that they have built. Given the strategy that they've used in the promises that have been broken their posting track record holds very little weight with me. Our HOA and the neighboring homes would like to see the current phase 2 proposal turned down in a buffer zone reconfigured into this project plan. I really do hope you guys turn down this proposal.

Thank You Tabatha Bollig

Sandy Vossler

From: Bracken, Kevin <kbracken@medassets.com>
Sent: Friday, January 16, 2015 6:26 PM
To: Sandy Vossler
Cc: mislane@aol.com
Subject: Kevin Bracken lot 25
Attachments: photo 1.JPG; ATT00001.txt; photo 2.JPG; ATT00002.txt; photo 1 (5).JPG; img120.jpg

Hi Sandy, Please add my comments below for the phase 2 development of Auburn Ridge. Also, please expect comments from the HOA and neighboring properties. Please see below thanks Kevin

The Story: The developer was seeking the neighborhoods support, and the council's approval to build higher than the two stories the property was zoned for. Our neighborhood was very supportive of allowing the developer, to build the additional story and not cause waves with the city Council. They sold us on two ideas: One, based on the phase 2 plan and that they would keep the buildings back from our property lines. The foundation was to be 80 feet from the property line. There were several proposals that were talked about for buffer zones between the property lines. Such as a dog park, a road, parking, and the buildings would be set back from our property lines so they would not obstruct our views intrusively. Two, was that they would dig phase 1 the three-story building, down lower and not increase site line more than what the two-story building would have. This is not true. Please see the attached. Developer, "We want to integrate into your neighborhood and add value and not just put a building right up to your property lines."

The Real Story: The sightlines from the homes are very intrusive. We now have an additional story that's intruding our site line. The developer built the foundation up, not down, please see the attached pictures vs the provided sight line. Once the phase 1 additional story and building is in place, phase 2 with the promises of buffer zones and appropriate distance from our homes has now been revamped. The entire platform that the developer asked for support and consideration has been removed. Once they gained their additional story and approval through city Council in support of the neighborhood the entire phase 2 project integration into the neighborhood was revamped. None of the promises that were made during our neighborhood meetings in relation to phase 2 have been followed through with, in the current proposal.

Original Phase 2: The original phase 2 had an 80 foot buffer for my property line. As mentioned above, the developer so that there would be a parking lot, dog park, road that would buffer the property line.

Current phase 2: The current proposed phase 2 foundation is 40 feet from my property line. That is only nine feet wider than my small backyard. The second story window from my home looks directly at the middle of the apartment complexes roof. Please see the attached architectural graphic of the sightlines from the second story window of the boring residents, which was provided from the developer. Please see attached

The sell - 55 and older: "These are going to be quiet neighbors but 55 and older and younger people will not want to live in this facility. We're going to keep the average price around \$800 younger people are not going to want to live in these type of facilities and they're not designed in that fashion."

The real story 55 and older: The developer wants to remove the age limitations and theme of the building is completely opposite of what was sold to the neighborhood and the Council. Developer wants no age restriction is my understanding. The average single unit is \$500 per month. The section 8 housing across the street has higher prices than what they're offering. I am supportive of affordable housing for seniors, but I also don't want low income housing boring my property and potentially decreasing my home's value.

In my opinion, this developer has strategically used the enticement of the neighborhood to gain speed, support, for their project on false pretenses. None, of the proposed benefits to integrate into Castle Highlands have been followed through with on their current proposal for phase 2. I believe this developer has told the Council, Castle Highlands what they wanted to hear to gain profit and a footprint in Castle rock. The developer has boasted about their ability to

maintain and hold the properties that they have built. Given the strategy that they've used in the promises that have been broken their posting track record holds very little weight with me. Our HOA and the neighboring homes would like to see the current phase 2 proposal turned down in a buffer zone reconfigured into this project plan.

Thanks,
Kevin Bracken

Kevin Bracken | Director | MedAssets
6300 S. Syracuse Way, Suite 495 | Centennial, CO, 80111 | Work: 720.407.1585 | Mobile: 720.201.3052
kbracken@medassets.com

Visit us at www.medassets.com
Follow us on LinkedIn, YouTube, Twitter and Facebook

*****Attention*****

This electronic transmission may contain confidential, sensitive, proprietary and/or privileged information belonging to the sender. This information, including any attached files, is intended only for the persons or entities to which it is addressed. Authorized recipients of this information are prohibited from disclosing the information to any unauthorized party and are required to properly dispose of the information upon fulfillment of its need/use, unless otherwise required by law. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by any person or entity other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender and properly dispose of the information immediately.

Sandy Vossler

From: jason bollig <jasonbollig@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 17, 2015 10:35 PM
To: Sandy Vossler; kbracken@medassets.com
Subject: Reg Auburn Ridege
Attachments: photo 1 (1).JPG; photo 2.JPG; photo 2.JPG; img120.jpg; photo 1 (5).JPG

Dear Sandy,

Please add my comments below for the phase 2 development of Auburn Ridge. Also, please expect comments from the HOA and neighboring properties. Please see below. I am extremely upset with the all the lies Auburn Ridge Developers have done. They really need to keep what they have promised and really keep the buffer zone and really it is just so upsetting to all I have talked to in all the homes surrounding the area. So many have placed how horrible this whole thing is.

My name is Jason Bollig and I live at 1470 Millbrook Court. borders the Auburn Ridge property. Sandy Vossler this needs to be addressed on our behalf and all the homes surrounding this. I have been to all the meetings and they have lies all the way through it.

The Story: The developer was seeking the neighborhoods support, and the council's approval to build higher than the two stories the property was zoned for. Our neighborhood was very supportive of allowing the developer, to build the additional story and not cause waves with the city Council. They sold us on two ideas: One, based on the phase 2 plan and that they would keep the buildings back from our property lines. The foundation was to be 80 feet from the property line. There were several proposals that were talked about for buffer zones between the property lines. Such as a dog park, a road, parking, and the buildings would be set back from our property lines so they would not obstruct our views intrusively. Two, was that they would dig phase 1 the three-story building, down lower and not increase site line more than what the two-story building would have. This is not true. Please see the attached. Developer, "We want to integrate into your neighborhood and add value and not just put a building right up to your property lines."

The Real Story: The sightlines from the homes are very intrusive. We now have an additional story that's intruding our site line. The developer built the foundation up, not down, please see the attached pictures vs the provided sight line. Once the phase 1 additional story and building is in place, phase 2 with the promises of buffer zones and appropriate distance from our homes has now been revamped. The entire platform that the developer asked for support and consideration has been removed. Once they gained their additional story and approval through city Council in support of the neighborhood the entire phase 2 project integration into the neighborhood was revamped. None of the promises that were made during our neighborhood meetings in relation to phase 2 have been followed through with, in the current proposal.

Original Phase 2: The original phase 2 had an 80 foot buffer for my property line. As mentioned above, the developer so that there would be a parking lot, dog park, road that would buffer the property line.

Current phase 2: The current proposed phase 2 foundation is 40 feet from my property line. That is only nine feet wider than my small backyard. The second story window from my home looks directly at the middle of the apartment complexes roof. Please see the attached architectural graphic of the sightlines from the second story window of the boring residents, which was provided from the developer. Please see attached

The sell - 55 and older: "These are going to be quiet neighbors but 55 and older and younger people will not want to live in this facility. We're going to keep the average price around \$800 younger people are not going to want to live in these type of facilities and they're not designed in that fashion."

The real story 55 and older: The developer wants to remove the age limitations and theme of the building is completely opposite of what was sold to the neighborhood and the Council. Developer wants no age restriction is my

understanding. The average single unit is \$500 per month. The section 8 housing across the street has higher prices than what they're offering. I am supportive of affordable housing for seniors, but I also don't want low income housing boring my property and potentially decreasing my home's value.

In my opinion, this developer has strategically used the enticement of the neighborhood to gain speed, support, for their project on false pretenses. None, of the proposed benefits to integrate into Castle Highlands have been followed through with on their current proposal for phase 2. I believe this developer has told the Council, Castle Highlands what they wanted to hear to gain profit and a footprint in Castle rock. The developer has boasted about their ability to maintain and hold the properties that they have built. Given the strategy that they've used in the promises that have been broken their posting track record holds very little weight with me. Our HOA and the neighboring homes would like to see the current phase 2 proposal turned down in a buffer zone reconfigured into this project plan.

Thanks,
Jason Bollig

Sandy Vossler

From: Gavin <gavint2002@aol.com>
Sent: Monday, January 19, 2015 1:08 PM
To: Sandy Vossler
Subject: Auburn Ridge Deveolpment: I do not support their current phase proposal

Hi Ms. Vossler,

We meet at a couple of the Auburn Ridge meetings. I reside at Castle Highlands, and have for 10 years. Since the developers of the Auburn Ridge have proposed their plans to develop the land behind my home it been a constant changing story of what they would do. Today their plan for phase II development is the equivalent of building a section 8 housing operation with rents and restrictions that would make those in the Reserve move over. This is not at all as they first promised with having this open to just 55 and above.

When I purchased my home in 2004, I made the foolish mistake to take the word of the Pultie Sales person that the land in back of my home was "open space"; shame on me for not doing my homework. Since then I have been watching and speaking out on the use of this property. In the past two years I know you will agree, the folks of Auburn Ridge have changed their story line a number of times. Today, had their current proposed plan been presented it would have been rejected by all parties involved.

They first proposed a 55 and older facility which was accepted and welcomed by many of Castle Highlands. Their position was that this would support the growing number of 55 year olds in our community. I liked the idea. In a meeting a few months back they wanted to take away the 55 year restrictions and open this up to all. But they told us that they would only rent to those near that age with families, and make these multi-bedroom apartments. I know this sounds cynical but given their track record of changing stories I don't believe it. My argument is what makes this any different from other rental facilities. It doesn't. And I have been informed that the proposed rents will be lower than what people are now paying for Second 8 rents.

In addition to this their development plan has now changes to build just 40 feet from my fence line. At one time that was 80 feet with just a one story building. Their current plan would have me on my deck looking right into the home and them into mine. No real buffer. I don't have a big back yard and adding more trees in my backyard to block their view into my home is not an option. I feel that this will greatly reduce the value of my home and those of my neighborhood.

I do not support the changes Auburn Properties are proposing.

Gavin Tomlinson

Owner, 951 Millbrook Cir, Castle Rock, CO

Castle Rock City Council

June 8 2015

Auburn Ridge Lot 2 Proposed Site Development Plan and Zoning Amendment

We are opposed to the changes to the Auburn Ridge Development that the developers discussed in our last town hall meeting.

We were willing and comfortable to allow the Auburn Ridge development and zoning as originally approved by the council. We feel that the proposed changes to the plan will adversely affect our property values and allow a lower income level of renters into the development. Our area is now over run with apartment developments and we do not need additional lower level units this close to Castle Highlands. The plan to have an upscale development for 55 and older is great and will be a good thing for our area and Castle Rock.

It is very apparent that the developers never planned to complete the development as approved, but only wanted to get the first stage in place and then move toward the next phase with this major change in zoning to allow renters to be of any age. We feel they had a hidden agenda from the start and we should not reward them by approving the proposed zoning changes.

We feel the council has done an outstanding job of moving Castle Rock to being a premiere city Colorado and we pray that you will not make a mistake by allowing the proposed changes that will have a negative impact on the Castle Highlands sub-division.

We do feel the revised changes to the building plans that will give more open space to the houses directly behind the new phase is appropriate and should be approved

If you have any questions please call us.

Michael A. Burgess CSP

Catherine Burgess

1443 Bethel Ct.

Castle Rock, Co 80109

Home 720-785-0773

Cell 830-613-0848