#### Good afternoon Marc:

I am Jon P. Inglis and I have resided at 6761 Marshall Drive for 45 years. The proposed property boundary line move between the Buddhist property at 6897 Marshall Road and the Bruce Johnson property at 6907 Marshall Road has the potential to be disastrous for me. The entire western edge of my property abuts the Johnson property. I have enjoyed my view of the Flatirons and the back range all those years and do not want them obstructed by some large monstrosity of a building on top of the mesa.

I have been told that the issues driving this request are that the Johnson garage is non conforming in that it is too close to the Buddhist's property line. If that is the case then the owners of the Johnson property should be required to tear it down. The other reason cited is drainage issues with water coming off the steep slope. My question is where have these "drainage" issues been for the last 30 years. If there are drainage issues they should have been addressed when the Johnson house was built and the Buddhist house. Drainage issues must be addressed in a site plan.

The Johnson property has an easement off of Marshall Road for the driveway and the house. There is no easement to the property off Marshall Drive that I am aware of. In fact access off of Marshall Drive would require crossing my property.

If we look at the big picture, this is nothing more than an underhanded attempt to circumvent current county regulations which prohibit subdivision of land that has already been subdivided in an attempt to move the current building site. These parcels of land were subdivided in 1936 by the Crown Coal Company according to my records. A former neighbor attempted to subdivide his 5 acres several years ago and his application was denied for the reason I just stated.

An issue has been raised about the stability of the hill leading down to the Johnson house. If this is indeed an issue, how did the Johnson house get approved in the first place? There are no mines in the vicinity of the properties on the mesa. What happened was the creation of an enormous pile of red ash tailings on the mesa from mines across what is now Marshall Road. As I said, I have lived here for 45 years. If that hill was going to subside it would certainly have done so by now.

I understand that the planning board can only consider what is placed before it but in this case I think the motive behind the requested action also needs some serious thought. My neighbors are all in agreement. We don't need any more structures impinging on view corridors that have existed and been enjoyed for decades.

Respectfully,

Jon P. Inglis

Hi Marc,

I am very disappointed and despondent to hear of the application the move the property line of our neighbors home. Ever since we moved here 9 years ago, our life has been more full mostly in part to the beautiful and unobstructed view to the West. We pride ourselves in this community as a group of single family dwellers who do not take the landscape for granted. A new structure would be right in our view corridor and would seriously impact the value of our property as well as impact our beautiful life up here.

Over the years, two other house owners have attempted a subdivision exemption and have been denied. There is no reason why the Buddhists should be approved, especially when I feel the request is simply to move their building site. I cannot imagine they really want to build a "single family dwelling" up on our hill.

Besides infringing upon our view, Red Ash Lane is a dirt road and not meant for any traffic other than the cars that belong to the existing home owners. There are many dogs that roam around without leashes and their freedom is part of our love for the area. Approving this would take that away. Plus the parking of all those cars for their "meetings" will be completely intrusive to our quiet neighborhood. And MOST importantly, we have a young child. She would not be able to feel comfortable walking on the road and there is no reason why her safety should be in jeopardy.

This is a residential neighborhood. They can park down off Marshall Road. And once they take over Bruce's home, they will have even MORE room for their meetings and parking. Please do NOT allow them to change the site plan. They will be unwelcome and cause a lot of angry neighbors. Is that something you want? Do you really want to approve something that will cause negativity and aggression in our area? This neighborhood has been sacred for decades and literally none of us welcome this plan.

Signed, sincerely concerned residents of this treasured neighborhood,

Annabel, Peter & Lyric Stelling

## Mr. Ambrosi,

This is James Hood at 7127 Marshall Dr. I spoke with you expressing some concerns with regards to the land subdivision now under review between the Johnson property and the Buddhist Center...specifically about a garage and its drainage problem.

Allow me to state a few observations.

1) The present boundaries of the reviewed properties have been in place for over 50 years.

2) What you and Boulder County Land Use are proposing is to disturb a neighborhood that has been in existence for over 50 years for a garage? Cannot a garage be moved, torn down, landscaped, or left as is? Boulder County Permit Dept. permitted this garage. Are we to assume a garage takes precedent over a neighborhood and its inhabitants? Also, are we to suppose that the drainage from above will change because the ownership of the adjacent land will change? It seems a poor excuse to cover possible ulterior motives.

3) By subdividing the Johnson property BCLU will be eliminating access to the remainder of that property, nearly 5 acres. In that process Land Use will be rerouting numerous vehicles through an established neighborhood now with little traffic thereby creating an unsafe traffic situation for children, pets, and elderly residents. Will BCLU be willing to accept responsibility and liability for their decision and possible mishaps?

4) As mentioned in Land Use responses, I have heard mentioned "unstable future building site" I refuse to believe that the purpose of BCLU is to enhance future sales of property for private interests. I would rather choose to believe that their purpose is to serve existing communities to promote safety and co-existence with natural settings.

5) It appears to me that by subdividing the Johnson property for the sake of a garage, BCLU is creating a hostile environment for those of us that have lived in the community for decades, and also creating a possible unsafe environment due to increased traffic in that community.

6) Mentioned by the Land Use Dept., was the concept of eliminating driveways along Marshall Road. Shall we again assume that the families on the mesa off of Red Ash Lane shall bear the burden of increased traffic and possible unsafe situations for the sake of one family? Can we be provided with the statistics concerning driveway accidents that have occurred on Marshall Road in the last 20 years?

Subdividing the Johnson property seems to be a very dismal choice given the non existence of a real and necessary need. The integrity of a neighborhood is at stake, as is the safety and well being of its occupants. Both are far more important that a

garage. Regards, James Hood 7127 Marshall Dr. Boulder, Co 80303 303-246-1233

From:	Susan Hood
To:	Ambrosi, Marc
Subject:	Docket # SE-18-0015 Vosper Boundry Line Adjustment
Date:	Monday, October 29, 2018 11:56:33 AM

OPPOSED!!This Is Susan Hood; I am a 28 year + home owner at 7127 Marshall Dr Boulder, CO 80303 303-246-1233.

Proposed Changes Locations 6897 & 6907 Marshall Dr Boulder, CO. 80303 The postcard notice was sent to our home , dated 10/25/18.

The Muckpos bought their current property and have had YEARS to resolve 'non- conforming structures,' if the drainage was indeed a problem. They were, in fact, 'friends' of Mr Johnson and had him in their home. Access Permit Requirement 1.3 " ..... in general one access is permitted for each legally established parcel or original parcel of land." That access is available to each property now..... in fact, approximately 13 ft from each other.

Public safety is stated. The Public Safety of 7 established homes who access our homes solely on RED ASH LANE, will be severely jeopardized and impacted if one "single family house," specifically the Muckpos, are granted this Subdivision Exemption.

Red Ash Lane, at best, is steep, rutted, and is generally a wash board, barely maintained by the county. That is just the North/South portion.

As stated, it is Boulder County's roll to review the applications for land use changes. We, the established neighborhood using Red Ash lane as our legal, and solo means of access to our (7) homes, urge BCLU to look at the big picture-do not grant this proposed land adjustment to the good of one family. The safety and well-being of 7 families is at stake.

Thank you. Respectfully, Susan Hood

Sent from my iPad

November 4, 2018

Mr. Marc Ambrosi Boulder County Land Use Department

## Re: Docket SE-18-0015: Vosper Boundary Line Adjustment

### Marc,

We are writing to express our opposition to the subdivision exemption application at 6907 and 6897 Marshall Dr (SE-18-0015; aka Johnson and Mukpo properties). Our home at 6881 Marshall Drive lies directly adjacent to the south and west of these two properties, and as such, we would be particularly impacted by this exemption.

As many of our neighbors have already pointed out to you, the Mukpo home is not really being utilized as a single family residence, but rather as a business – specifically as an event/conference center for their international Shambhala organization. In fact, in the nearly four years we have lived on Marshall Drive, the family is absent the vast majority of the time, yet events continue to occur. How do we know when the family is not there? Well, there is an obvious increase in security presence (security guards walking the property, etc.), and the children and their nannies are out and about (their play structures and trampoline sit at the far west boundary of their property –directly adjacent to and on the other side of a low fence from our property. The children and their nannies are extremely friendly, and often wave and express greetings to us when they are residing at the home. But, as previously stated – this is a rarity as the family does not reside in this particular home all that often. Indeed, it has now been many months since we have seen any sign of the family.

Moreover, when we have had problems in the past (e.g., one of their sprinkler lines broke last spring and was gushing water for days, which was draining onto our property, which lies downhill from theirs), we were never able to speak with any member of the family, but rather with a caretaker who happened to be out and about. On that particular occasion last spring, we were directed to the House Manager, Mark Thorp, who had the broken sprinkler line repaired.

Our real concern, however, as it relates to the true nature of the use of the Mukpo home (as an event/conference center), is that their septic system, which was installed and intended for the occupancy of a single family residence, becomes over-loaded when they hold their events, which is on a fairly regular basis – particularly during the spring and summer. During these events, what appears to be upwards of 30 to 50 people descend on the home. After these events, there is noticeable drainage onto our property, which lies directly downhill from their property. The OWS permit for the Mukpo property appears to be for a single family, 4 bedroom house. As the house has at least 7 bedrooms, they are already in violation of the

permit. With the house being used as a conference center, the number of people using the septic system greatly exceeds the capacity of the system to properly handle the waste water. Making changes to the boundaries of the property would likely increase the occupancy, and would further exacerbate a pre-existing problem.

Furthermore, as our neighbors have pointed out, we believe the real intention of this application by the Mukpos is to expand their event/conference center, by utilizing the part of the Johnson property that would be annexed onto their property for additional parking, and to build an another residence on the new 6907 Marshall Drive parcel (with access off of Red Ash), to accommodate additional attendees for their conference events.

For the above reasons, we believe that the current subdivision alignment should be maintained, and that furthermore, the current use of Mukpo residence at 6897 Marshall Drive should be investigated, as it appears to not conform with the intended purpose (that of a single family residence), and furthermore, the regular events that are held at this location put a strain on the property's septic system, which impacts our property which lies directly downgradient from their property.

We unfortunately will be out of town attending our daughter's graduation on December 6, and as such will not be able to attend the formal hearing that evening. However, should you wish to contact us beforehand to discuss anything we have written above, you can reach us at the numbers below.

Thank you.

Bruce and Judy Lawson 6881 Marshall Drive, Boulder, Co 80303

Bruce's cell: 303-396-5767 Judy's cell: 303-941-9997 From: Tim Bates To: Ambrosi, Marc Subject: Boundary change at 6897 Marshall Road and 6907 Marshall Road Re: On-site pre-application, PAC-18-0412 at 6907 Marshall Drive Date: Monday, October 31, 2018 12:42:35 PM

#### Mr. Ambrosi,

My wife and I live at 1230 Red Ash Lane, which is directly east of the properties at 6897 and 6907 Marshall Road in Boulder County. We have lived here more than 8 years with great relationships with our neighbors, with the possible exception of the people at 6897 Marshall Drive. On several occasions, dozens of cars have parked along Red Ash beyond three of the driveways there, including ours, from where visitors walk to 6897 Marshall Road for religious (Buddhist) activities lasting more than twelve hours. We have politely asked them more than once to restrict parking to their own property, but the requests have fallen on deaf ears. This activity, which I believe is prohibited by Boulder County law, is a primary concern to me for allowing the boundary line change. I understand the benefits of moving the boundary line from the letter you wrote to them dated October 22, 2018, but it will likely facilitate more visitors to the Buddhist center or even enable a second facility (house) to be built on the property at 6907 Marshall for even more people. I believe their lack of conformance in terms of the use of the property would continue with new construction. It would make an already tense situation worse, with law enforcement by the sheriff as the only recourse. Furthermore, Red Ash Lane is a dirt road, and is normally extremely rough with potholes. Adding more traffic will further degrade the road surface.

I request that the boundary line adjustment not be permitted on the grounds that: (a) we all purchased our properties with the understanding that the building sites are and have been established for several decades; (b) the prospective buyer intends to use the two properties to further their business/religious activities and not as a purely residential property with increased traffic as the primary detriment to our neighborhood.

Respectfully,

Tim Bates 720-217-7964 Marc Ambrosi Boulder County Planning Re: SE-18-0015

I am writing to register my strong opposition to the subdivision exemption application at 6907 and 6897 Marshall Dr (SE-18-0015; i.e., Johnson and Mukpo properties). This application is being presented as a simple agreement between two property owners to resolve issues related to transportation and water drainage, but it is clear that the primary goal is to change the current building site on the Johnson property to the top of Davidson Mesa. This application appears to be just the first step in that process and the manner it is being proposed is underhanded. If this boundary adjustment is approved, I believe it will be nearly impossible to stop a very intrusive development on the top of the mesa.

I'd first like to discuss the specifics of the application.

#### **Specifics of the Application**

The original reasons stated for the application (as seen on page 1 of the application and as explained by the planning department) were to: 1) resolve a non-conforming garage on the Mukpo property; and 2) resolve water drainage issues. The first reason has now apparently been dropped because it is ridiculous. The Mukpo garage is only non-conforming because the Mukpos built a non-conforming structure in 2015 (SPR-15-0530), i.e., they created the non-conforming status themselves. The applicant must have realized how weak this argument is and so they have come up with another "reason" to change property lines that have been in existence for decades. The evolving nature of these reasons speaks to the disingenuousness of the application.

Regarding the new reasons in the current application:

- Drainage
  - The current Johnson residence is on a flat site that has been there since 1925. If there are any potential drainage/soil issues, these can be resolved by competent soil and structural engineers with appropriate grading and other remediation. That such an issue would necessitate moving the building site strains credulity. There are many houses on the slopes of Davidson Mesa (along Marshall Rd) that testify to the ability to build on the lower and sloping areas of the mesa.
- Transportation
  - Removing the current driveway will not make Marshall Rd any safer. However, the change will increase safety risks on Red Ash Ln. This is because re-routing traffic to Red Ash Ln will still require drivers to turn off of Marshall Rd. However, there will be an increased risk after the turn is made. Currently, when drivers exit Marshall Rd onto the Johnson driveway, there are no further safety concerns because the car is then on a private drive with no other traffic (either cars or pedestrians). However, if this traffic is routed onto Red Ash Ln, these additional cars will have to pass multiple residences and will undoubtedly encounter other cars, children, pets, etc., thereby increasing safety risk on Red Ash Ln.
- Article 9-102.B, paragraph c of the Land Use Code states:
  - c. A boundary line adjustment shall not be approved primarily for convenience of construction and shall substantially advance a legitimate land use purpose under this Code.

 While there is no specific proposal for new construction in this application, the clear intent of the application is to move the building site and build a new structure. Thus, this application violates this criterium because the underlying intent is "primarily for convenience of construction".

### The Big Picture

While the applicants state that there is no current application to build on the proposed reconfigured property, it is clear that this is the ultimate goal. Thus, this application should not be approved in isolation without looking at the "big picture" implications. Once the property line is moved and the current building site is no longer on the Johnson property, future development will be forced onto the top of Davidson Mesa. This will inflict a tremendous burden on the entire neighborhood.

- Traffic/safety
  - o The Mukpo property is currently considered a single-family residence but it is used as a spiritual center and it therefore generates a very large amount of traffic. In addition to the vehicles from the family that park in the garage and driveway, there are many other vehicles each day from staff (body guards, caretakers, etc.) and visitors who park in the accessory parking lot on the south side of Marshall Rd. In addition, there are periodic meetings at the Mukpo property when several dozen cars park along Marshall Rd and up Red Ash Ln. Red Ash Ln is a dead-end street that is currently very quiet. We have every reason to believe that, if the access is moved, a similar volume of traffic will be routed up Red Ash Ln. This increased volume of traffic will cause serious safety concerns for children, elderly residents, and dogs. It will tremendously impact the character of the neighborhood and our quality of life.
- Visual Impact/Views
  - The current Johnson house is tucked into the hillside, a site that minimizes the visual impact of the house from surrounding public spaces and other homes in the area. A new building site on top of the mesa would make any new house the most dramatic structure on top of Davidson Mesa and it would be visible for miles around, including from Marshall Rd, Marshall Mesa open space, and Davidson Mesa open space. It would also substantially affect the views of multiple neighbors to the east, north and south and would severely impact property values for all in the neighborhood. No amount of mitigation during a future SPR application will prevent the imposition of a tremendous adverse impact on the neighborhood and surrounding areas.
  - One of the great things about Red Ash Ln is that it is so dark at night. There are no street lights and only a handful of houses. The stars are brilliant and the silhouette of the mountains at night is beautiful. A new large house on the most prominent point on Marshall Mesa with the accompanying lights has the potential to ruin this. It would be like having a lighthouse on the crest of the mesa and it would be visible for miles.
- Good of the Few Versus the Many
  - If this application is rejected, no one will be harmed since the status quo will be maintained.
    However, approval of this application would benefit the Johnson and Mukpo properties at the expense of every other property owner in the neighborhood. Giving such an enormous benefit to a new prospective owner at the expense of property owners who have been

there for many years seems to be more than just a little bit wrong. Any potential small benefit from getting a single driveway off of Marshall Rd will be dwarfed by the ruination of a neighborhood.

For the above reasons, I believe that the current subdivision alignment should be maintained. This will preserve the current Johnson house location as the preferred building site for future redevelopment.

Bret Fulton 1223 Red Ash Ln Boulder, Co 80303 October 31, 2018

Marc Ambrosi Boulder County Planning 2045 13th Street Boulder, CO 80302

Re: Boundary line adjustment for 6897 & 6907 Marshall Rd., Boulder, CO

Dear Marc,

I know that I had sent you an email a couple of weeks ago regarding the proposed boundary line changes, but as reasons in the formal application for the subdivision exemption have changed, I thought I should put together a more formal letter to be presented in the public record.

When we first spoke, the application proposed the change to correct a boundary infringement by a garage. You had mentioned that they wanted to move the boundary line above the existing house and garage of 6907 Marshall and that it was a straight forward subdivision exemption request. As concerned neighbors began to question this boundary line adjustment, it seems that the applicant, Mukpo Miphan has altered the reasons for the change. This is not a minor, straightforward boundary adjustment between neighbors.

Ultimately, Mr. Miphan wants to purchase 6907 Marshall Rd., from the Estate of Bruce Johnson in order to build a residence on top of the mesa. His proposal includes several issues that would make that probable with the approval of the proposed boundary line adjustment. By blocking off the existing driveway, there would no longer be access to the 6907 property, except from Red Ash Lane. This access from Marshall has been there almost 100 years without any known incidents. The proposal also includes concerns over drainage, prior mining operations in the area, and landslide risk.

As a homeowner that would be greatly impacted by a house built on the mesa, I offer these objections to approving the subdivision exemption.

- 1) All of the homeowners in the Red Ash neighborhood are united in opposition to the construction of house on top of the mesa, as it will affect our views of the Flatirons, increase our traffic and alter the existing neighborhood.
- 2) All of the homeowners living along Red Ash Lane can testify to the increased traffic that result in Mr. Miphan's use of his home for meeting and congregating when he is in town. His followers come and park up and down

the dirt road and have at times made exiting our driveway a concern. Marc, you assure me that they would have to sign an affidavit stating that it would be used as a residence, but why would they need side-by-side residences? Also, since they have used their residence as a meeting place in the past, we believe they will expand their use of the properties for business/religious purposes.

- 3) Since the values of all of the existing homes are largely based on the unobstructed views, this will diminish the value of the 8+ homes that have existed. All of the neighbors have been told by employees of Boulder County that there is a strong regard by the County to require that homes rebuilt use the existing building site and current access point. That's why we have been lead to believe that we would not need to fear a house built in our view corridor.
- 4) This is the most concerning point of all... We are existing homeowners, and should have greater standing in this issue than a prospective buyer. It seems that the subdivision exemption is about accommodating a prospective buyer so that he can build on top of the mesa. This would be at the greater expense to those residents that have been here for years, and for some decades. We would all lose value for his personal, (potential – since he hasn't even acquired the land) future benefit.
- 5) All of the issues brought up in the request (i.e., drainage, soil) are issues that other homeowners would have to address in the normal course of building, yet by granting the exemption, he would be almost guaranteed to achieve the ultimate goal of a house on the mesa. This is not a minor boundary line adjustment.

I was told by the County that since the view corridor is a of prime consideration to the County, that a house would probably never be built on the mesa as it would impact the views from open space and Marshall Road. If that is still a consideration, then the County should not approve the exemption.

Some of the residents that have been here many years have suggested that this might cause them to feel the need to move. I am hoping that the neighborhood's concern carry more weight than a potential buyer.

I strongly urge the planning group to oppose this exemption, as it will most assuredly result in a house on the mesa by blocking access to the property from Marshall Road. As far as I know, there have not been any accidents from the access points on Marshall Road. I ask that you protect the integrity of the Red Ash community and the long-time residents.

Sincerely,

Lisa Bates 1230 Red Ash Ln., Boulder, CO 80303

#### Ask a Planner

Boulder County Property Address	1223 RED ASH LN
If your comments are regarding a specific docket, please enter the docket number	SE-18-0015
Name *	Lisa rogers
Email Address *	Irogers382@aol.com
Phone Number	(720) 933-6960

Please enter your question or comment

Although the documents for this request are not yet available, we are very concerned that granting this property line change will result in a new building site on top of Davidson Mesa (6907 Marshall Drive). From a recent discussion with a planner I feel that most of the reasons for moving the property line (nonconforming garage, water drainage) are being used so that the top of the land can be built on. This would mean that the driveway will most likely be moved to the top of the hill. Very concerned about the amount of traffic that will be going by our house. Our house is positioned close to the road and it would mean more cars. If a house is built on the top of the hill it will not only impact our view but also our neighbors.

We built our house at 1223 Red Ash Lane 4 years ago. We checked into the possibility of a house being built (with Boulder County) on top of the mesa and were told that if a house is rebuilt the previous house location is the recommended location.

My understanding is that the application is citing the unstable soil and drainage issues. There are houses down lower and throughout the neighborhood who are lower ground along with 6907 Marshall Drive so these issues can be mitigated through engineering. We had to use twice as many caissons as planned on. We followed all of the SPR rules to build our house. We overextended ourselves financially to build the house. We built in good faith that the SPR rules we followed would also be the SPR rules to built up higher on the hill and block views. I also do not understand how the garage addition hat was permitted and reviewed by the compliance, and now is not. Is this really a good enough reason to allow the building site to be moved and block views? We are strongly opposed to changing the property line, because it will lead to new construction on top of the meas. This will affect not only our view, but also the view from Marshall Rd. and from Open Space (Marshall Mesa and Davidson Mesa).

Public record acknowledgement \*

• I acknowledge that this submission is considered a public record and will be made available by request under the Colorado Open Records Act.

-----Original Message-----From: Ambrosi, Marc --mambrosi@bouldercounty.org>-To: Lisa Rogers --fongers382@aal.com>-Sent: Mon, Oct 29, 2018 4:02 pm Subject: RE: Ask a Building Official - Web inquiry from Lisa rogers - SE-18-0015

Hello Lisa, I apologize, I've spent the last hour looking for your comments and don't see them. If you would resend your comments to me I will make sure they are included with the rest of the comments and please address them to mambrosi@bouldercounty.org otherwise they are very easy to miss. Once again I apologize for missing the emails.

Marc Ambrosi Boulder County Land Use Planner II Tel: 720 564 2636

From: Lisa Rogers [mailto:trogers382@aol.com] Sent: Monday, October 29, 2018 2:10 PM To: Ambrosi, Marc Subject: Re: Ask a Building Official - Web inquiry from Lisa rogers - SE-18-0015

I submitted a letter, which I do not see in the attachments. I believe there was also a letter from Cyndi and John Benson?

Thanks for the information. Lisa Rogers

----Original Message-----From: Ambrosi, Marc <-nambrosi@boulder.county.org> To: IcogenS82@alo.com <-loogenS82@alo.com> Seut: Mon, Oct 29, 2018 1:52 pm Subject: RE-18.48 Building Official - Web inquiry from Lisa rogers - SE-18-0015

Hello Lisa, I can share the information I do have, but following up with the Colorado Division of Reclamation, Mining, and Safety would provide more detailed information. Based on our internal correspondence, it appears the information we have comes from the Public Health dataset, but is based on atta information. Our records indicate there are two mine shafts on 6007 Marshall Drive. One is located just south of the existing Johnson residence and was likely an air shaft, the other is on the western portion of the parcel. It is unclear how accurate the data we have is. The mane of the mine was the "Old Crown Mine." I also know that the Johnson residence was initially constructed in 1925 and was used as the mining office. It has since had a number of additions to turn it into the structure that is out there today. We are going through historic review to determine the historic value, if any, of the structures on the property.



Below are two pictures of the mining operations. The first is of the Gorham Mine and comes from around a mile up the valley on, or near, what is today Marshall Drive, and the second image is of the office from the Old Crown Mine, which was located on the Johnson property (6907 Marshall Drive).





I have also attached the current list of comments we have received regarding this project. They are not posted online yet because they continue to roll in and I would like to upload all of them once the referral period is over (35 day referral period).

Please let me know if you have additional questions or comments.

Marc Ambrosi Boulder County Land Use Planner II Tel: 720 564 2636

# -----Original Message----From Reamusen, Jon Sent Mondy, October 29, 2018 11:28 AM To: #LandUsePlanner Subject: FW: Ack a Building Official - Web inquiry from Lisa rogers - SE-18-0015

Hello Planners Please help Lisa Rogers with her docket questions.

----Original Message----From: Workoy, October 29, 2018 11:13 AM Sret: Mondky, October 29, 2018 11:13 AM To: #LandUseBuildingOfficial Subject: Ask a Building Official Web inquiry from Lisa rogers - SE-18-0015

Boulder County Property Address (NOT FOR CITIES OR TOWNS, PLEASE SEE CITY/TOWN CONTACT INFORMATION ABOVE) : 1223 RED ASH LN If your question or comment is regarding a specific Building Permit please enter Building Permit number (example: BP-01-100): SE-18-0015 Email Address: Inogers S22 anaLcom Phone Number; (20) 933-6960 Please enter your question or comment: Where do I go to find letters that have been put on public record for this proposal? Could yous send records of any mining activity in the area? We know that processing of Red Ash. Would like to know if there was actual mining.

Thanks for your time! Liss Rogers Public record acknowledgement : Iacknowledge that this submission is considered a public record and will be made available by request under the Colorado Open Records Act.