


From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [Sandy Vossler](#)
Subject: Bella Mesa South proposed project comment
Date: Friday, September 26, 2025 10:39:49 AM
Attachments: [Headlight Study-2022- Bella Mesa South.pdf](#)

Hello,

Attached is a scan of the pages I have from a Headlight Study done in 2022 by NextMetro regarding existing neighbors concerns of headlights shining directly into their backyards and homes from vehicles turning onto the proposed street, Rock Canyon Trail. In 2022, I was on Town Council, representing District 5. At that time, homeowners, one in particular, expressed concerns regarding vehicle headlights shining into their home and backyard. Tara Vargish and I met with the homeowner and NextMetro and discussed the situation. It resulted in the attached study. I'm providing this study so it will be included in the record of comments on the Bella Mesa South proposed project. I would like it noted that neighbors have concerns regarding vehicle headlights disturbing/intruding the use of their homes and feel that development on the Bella Mesa South site should mitigate any negative impacts of vehicle headlights on their property. Thank you.

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

P.S. I apologize for the scan not being all that great. My scanner can't scan wider documents. I did the best that I could.



SITUATED IN THE SOUTHEAST 1/4 OF SECTION 8, TOWNSHIP 8 SOUTH, RANGE 66 WEST OF THE 6TH P.M., TOWN OF CASTLE ROCK, COUNTY OF DOUGLAS, STATE OF COLORADO


MITCHELL CLASH TRACT 5
FOUNDERS VILLAGE PLNG NO. 24
REC NO. 200604808
OWNER: TOWN OF CASTLE ROCK

TRACT B
FOUNDERS VILLAGE
PLNG NO. 24
AMENDMENT NO. 7
REC NO. 202112218
OWNER: TOWN OF CASTLE ROCK

REVISION DATE: 05-13-2022

Bella Mesa by Richmond
American Homes

family Petsitting



From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sandy Vossler](#)
Subject: Re: Meeting for Neighborhood Meeting – Bella Mesa South – Proposed Site
Date: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 9:21:11 PM

Thank you Sandy for the detailed information. I'm happy to see that the other side is protected. What's a shame is that we only have 7 houses on this side that will be impacted if those townhomes go up. There is open space next to the last house if only the townhomes were only allowed to that spot and the rest stays open. We lose all our views from this side of the road. Which I get this was zoned before these houses were built. I wish I would have known that before buying as it's nice to look across even though there is a road here to the open space and the views.

Again I really appreciate the feedback and information.

On Apr 23, 2025, at 11:24 AM, Sandy Vossler <SVossler@crgov.com> wrote:

[REDACTED]

I do understand your perspective, however, the 9.3 acre property is already zoned for multi-family development, meaning the permitted uses and maximum heights are already established. Below is a screen shot of what the zoning allows on the property. The next step in the development process is site planning. The applicant is proposing is the Site Development Plan, that determines how the site will be designed.

<image002.png>

<image003.png>

At the time the current zoning was approved by Town Council in 2014, the Town did acquire an additional 12.3 acres of public land adjacent to the site on the north side. That 12.3 acres combined with the 14.2 acre open space to the west of this property will remain undeveloped and will continue to provide a corridor for larger wildlife and habitat for small animals. Regarding the number of homes proposed, the zoning on the property allows up to 196 dwelling units. The proposal discussed at the meeting last night is for 95 townhomes. I realize this probably doesn't ease your concerns, but I do want to be transparent and provide you with factual information. Sandy

Sandy Vossler, Senior Planner
Town of Castle Rock
Development Services Department
100 N. Wilcox Street
Castle Rock, CO 80109
Office: 720-733-3556
<image001.png>

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sandy Vossler](#)
Subject: Re: Bella mesa South SDP
Date: Wednesday, August 20, 2025 2:16:05 PM

Thanks for that.

In the real world, this is still not adequate. In practice, the number of homes that actually can park two cars in a garage is a significant minority. These homes have no storage and families have a lot to store! I would bet that less than 25% of homes will park two cars inside. This still leaves a parking deficiency, and in this location, there is no on street alternative.

This is a typical planning department error I have seen in countless communities. I have spent 18 years in HOA community management and have dealt with this issue over and over. There needs to be a real world consideration made and have the number of spaces adjusted. Code for this type of community is not sufficient and should be updated.

Thanks

On Wed, Aug 20, 2025 at 1:07 PM Sandy Vossler <SVossler@crgov.com> wrote:

[REDACTED]

You are correct, if only 16 spaces were provided that would be very inadequate. The Municipal Code requires 2 parking spaces for each single family attached unit (townhome), as well as for regular single family detached homes. You will see in the plan that 2 spaces are being provided per unit as enclosed garage spaces. The 16 spaces you are seeing on the plan are additional, excess surface parking spaces. The summary table on the first sheet of the Site Development Plan indicates the number of spaces in total being provided.

If you have any other questions that I can help answer for you, feel free to email or call me. Thank you and have a great rest of your day. Sandy

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sandy Vossler](#)
Subject: Development near Mitchell and Mikelson
Date: Wednesday, May 21, 2025 12:10:16 PM

We were told that when we purchased our home in Bella Mesa, the town homes to be built behind and directly across from us would be single story. Now we hear they will be 40-50 feet. This will take away completely from our view and a huge reason why we chose the house. We will literally be staring at town homes..... How will this affect property value? Why not leave an open space just as what it is - open.

This is ridiculous. We would not have bought this home knowing you are allowing multi level town homes to be built in such a beautiful spot. It's not all about profit.

[REDACTED]

Sent from my iPhone (please excuse any spelling or autocorrect errors)

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Sandy Vossler](#)
Subject: Hybrid meeting comments
Date: Tuesday, August 26, 2025 12:40:11 PM

I appreciate the opportunity to have a voice with this site development plan. According to the description, the property located at the NW corner of Mikelson Boulevard and Mitchell Street is within the Bella Mesa Planned Development **approved by the town council 10 years ago in 2015**. I moved to the Castle Rock community in 2018, and moved into Castle Rock in a new build in 2019. The reason for locating here was that it was one of very few homes without stairs, and just enough space for me. Not only that it has a beautiful prairie across Michell road that makes the space of the land larger with the mountain range in view on a nice day. There is a body of water on the trail that extends from Mickelson to the middle school that is lovely with trees, bushes and wild life. Perfect for me and I know my neighbors would echo my observations.

The problem with the effort to put townhomes in this space is that there will not be a beautiful space here. Why fill up every square foot of land, grass, natural water, trails with housing? It does not compliment the Colorado landscape in any way, and clutters this space.

When I went back to do some research on the land, and the community, the population in 2015 was approximately 35,000 less people than is here in Castle Rock today. What happens with the voices that have were not here for 10 years? I think it is reasonable that some of the people in 2015 that are part of the census numbers counted and do not even live here anymore. Many people have moved as the housing is not affordable. Without a doubt, there are families that do not have a good feeling about the fact that they did not have a voice in 2015..some would comment that they would not have felt that squeezing in the new homes was something that they would support. Squeezing is an accurate description when visualizing the spacing of the homes, alley loading, and the entry ways that are stair steps. You cannot see the grass or zeroscaping because of the increased number of homes that fill in all the space that could be a great meadow and open space. How does the city government capture this important population that is the here and now? Many of us do not want this development. The council members that are supposed to represent us....who are they, and what have they done to get the entire population 10 years later in the decision meeting?

Have condos in this area with parking access in the back of the building which is an alley does not sound appealing. I know some residents with condos like this....they are difficult to park cars with the other residents, and appealing is not a word that comes to mind.

Do we need 196 more families in this open area? 20 dwelling units per acre sounds crowded and unsightly. When is the constant building of the community going to stop? **Create and nourish a meadow**, it sounds much more appealing than more housing obstructing the mountain views, more noisy traffic, more night lighting, and more roads to congest that landscape.

Just because it was approved 10 years ago does not mean that community wants to support it and can support it in 2025. Stop the building, support a meadow. Let the community have a voice in 2025 that counts.

I appreciate the opportunity to share my views,