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The Pueblo Regional Development Plan, undertaken by the Pueblo Area Council of Governments (PACOG), is one of the most important initiatives in regional planning recent history. This initiative is a joint venture of the City of Pueblo, Pueblo County, the Metro Districts of Pueblo West and Colorado City, the towns of Beulah and Rye, School Districts 60 and 70, the Pueblo Board of Water Works, and the Salt Creek Sanitation District under the auspices of the Pueblo Area Council of Governments. The Plan was adopted by the Planning Commission of Pueblo County, as well as reviewed and recommended for approval by the City of Pueblo’s Planning and Zoning Commission and subsequently adopted by the Pueblo City Council and the Pueblo County Board of Commissioners.

Decisions made as a result of this initiative, will have an impact on the area’s quality of life for many years into the future. These decisions ultimately affect the area’s land use, economic development, recreation and public facilities, infrastructure development, traffic circulation, as well as the direction of residential, commercial and industrial growth in the community.

The plan serves an advisory document to assist the Pueblo Region in accommodating a future population of 200,000 people, which the Region is projected to reach by 2030. The plan is an evolving document that provides guidance for a variety of growth-related issues. The plan is general in nature, offering broad development principles, policies, and strategies to guide land use decisions that shape the Region’s pattern of physical development.

Planning Process

The Regional Development Plan was developed over a two year time period with the assistance of the Burnham Group, a consulting firm that spent substantial time becoming familiar with the community and its issues. The Plan charts the course of growth and development for future generations, with significant input from citizens and interest groups incorporated into the Plan.

The Plan consists of two documents, the Plan Narrative and the Plan Brochure. The Plan Narrative offers the following:

- A brief history of Pueblo County’s historical development;
- A description of the public input process (Community Outreach);
- An analysis of the Pueblo Region’s projected growth (Land Demand Analysis) and the ability to accommodate growth (Capacity Analysis);
- Regional development principles (Guiding Principles);
Understanding Pueblo’s Development History

Early History of the Region

Pueblo represents two cultures and the land that now makes Pueblo and Pueblo County was for many years in two countries... New Spain and the United States with the Arkansas River serving as the dividing line between the two.

In 1806, Lt. Zebulon Pike was sent by the United States to explore the Louisiana Purchase. He included his report a description of camping at the mouth of the Fountain, where it meets the Arkansas, for six days while he attempted, unsuccessfully, to reach the summit of Pikes Peak—which he reportedly first spotted from his Pueblo camp.

The early-recorded history of the Pueblo Region has its roots in the natural trade routes along the Arkansas River and Fountain Creek. Spanish and French probably traveled through the area in the 18th century. In 1821, Mexico declared its independence from Spain and opened the international border to trading, leading to a significant expansion of activity in the region. One of the first events recorded in Pueblo County, after Pike’s brief stay occurred in 1841, was the establishment of a seasonal trading post by George Simpson on what was then called Foutaine qui bouille, or the “fountain that boils”. Charles Gantt operated another trading post some six miles down the river where the Purgatoire flowed into the Arkansas. When that post was abandoned, they moved 70 miles down the Arkansas to found Bent’s Fort that became famous as an important stop along the Santa Fe Trail. By 1842, Simpson and his associates had established Fort Pueblo. It remained an active trading post until 1854. Unfortunately, a significant part of the early trade involved selling liquor to the Indians in the region.

In 1849, the Mexican War ended with the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. With that treaty, the land south of the Arkansas became part of the United States. With that treaty, the land south of the Arkansas became part of the United States. Under the terms of that treaty, the young country agreed to recognize many of the Spanish and Mexican land grants in the newly acquired territory. Those included the important Nolan Grant, which provided...
the land on which Colorado Coal & Iron developed its early plant and its company town of Bessemer.

In 1853, Congress approved a new central railroad route to the Pacific planned through the Arkansas Valley. This expanded the level of interest in the area. In a related event, Ceran St. Vrain, one of the holders of the large Vigil & St. Vrain Grant, persuaded Charles Autobee to lead a group of settlers to establish homes on the grant. They settled in 1853 along the Huerfano River, at the eastern edge of what is now Pueblo County. On Christmas Day in 1854, Ute Indians—with whom the fort had long had friendly trading relations, wiped out the entire population of Fort Pueblo in a massacre.

That incident eliminated the settlement but not the history or its continuity. Charles Autobee, William Bent, Dick Wooton, Joseph Doyle and others involved in the early trading posts remained in the area as permanent settlements were established. In 1858 and 1859, the gold rush came to Colorado and Pueblo became an important trading post between the gold fields of Cripple Creek, the more limited mines of the Wet Mountain Valley and the Great Plains as the gateway to the rest of the United States. By 1860, civic leaders were laying out the original City of Pueblo. Two years later, other leaders began to organize Pueblo County, then including within its boundaries lands that now make up several Colorado counties.

In 1870 or 1871, a subsidiary of the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad, led by Gen. William Palmer, of Colorado Springs, began developing South Pueblo on land that had once been part of the Nolan Grant. In 1871, Puebloans supported a bond issue to help subsidize the southward expansion of the D&RG and in 1874 the railroad reached the City. In 1872, the City of Pueblo was formally incorporated. By 1880, the Colorado Coal & Iron Company emerged as the steel company that would shape the community for most of the next century.

The industrial expansion and the gradual civilization of the area brought a large influx of Eastern settlers who established farms on the north side of the Arkansas River to produce food for the mining communities. Pueblo's abundant source of water prompted the development of rail access to the mines and the shipment of ores into Pueblo for processing. Soon Pueblo became known as the “Smelting Capital of the American West.”

Pueblo's history also includes Doc Holiday who was arrested on Mean Avenue for gambling, as well as Bat Masterson who was brought in as sheriff of South Pueblo to protect the building of a railroad from Pueblo to Leadville.

Much of Pueblo's ranching history has its roots in cattle being driven up from Texas on the Goodnight-Loving Trail to feed the military posts and mining activities in the Southwest.
name. The growth in the cattle business brought to the Pueblo area feed lots, sales barns, packing houses, stock saddle manufacturing (the Pueblo style of stock saddle) and the establishment of major ranches such as the Thatcher, Hatchet and Butler Ranches. Pueblo not only had cattle ranching, but also sheep raising and a large number of dairy farmers. These ranchers supplied the increasing demand for beef created by the mining market.

Settlement patterns in southwest Pueblo County formed around the towns of Beulah, Rye and Greenhorn. Homesteaders or former military personnel settling on what was called “preempted land” made available through the Army developed these mountain meadow settlements. As the War Between the States broke out, Mace’s Hole or Beulah Valley, served as a training location for confederate interests. After the war many of these towns served as trade centers for traffic going south to New Mexico along the Taos Trail. Later these areas came to be known by health seekers and those suffering from tuberculosis, as well as summer retreats.

City of Pueblo Development

As noted above, Pueblo was first incorporated in March 1870. Its north/south, east/west grid was bound by what is now 7th Street on the north, River Street on the south, Bradford Street on the east and Grand Avenue on the west. As was typical of most new towns of the era, residences intermingled with the various stores, shops and liveries necessary to support a community of the time. This original plat of Pueblo now comprises the core of the Downtown area.

A second new town, South Pueblo, was established with the arrival of the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad in October 1873. The town was platted on a northeast/southwest, northwest/southeast grid parallel with the railroad tracks, which generally followed the course of the Arkansas River. The town was bound on the southwest by Adams Avenue, on the northwest by Cleveland Avenue, on the southeast by Washington Street and on the northeast and east by present-day Elizabeth Street and Santa Fe Avenue. The area is recognizable today as the “Mesa Junction” neighborhood and the area around the Union Avenue Historic District.

A third community known as Central Pueblo was incorporated in June 1882 and consisted of roughly the area between “Pueblo” and “South Pueblo.” The area consisted mostly of commercial and industrial uses related to Pueblo’s fledgling railroad and steel industries and was established both as neutral territory for city hall and as a tax free town in Pueblo.

The steel industry also gave rise to a fourth town, Bessemer, which was situated near the Colorado Coal and Iron Company (CF&I) steel plant. The town was platted in 1880, and incorporated in 1886. The area is still known as the Bessemer neighborhood.

Pueblo, South Pueblo, and Central Pueblo consolidated into the single town of Pueblo in March 1886. The town of Bessemer was annexed in
1894. With these consolidations and annexation, the total population of the new city of Pueblo rose to 26,000 persons.

Twentieth Century Development

In 1921, a flood devastated the community. Even 50 years later, the high-water marks were still visible on walls of occupied buildings, and archival copies of the local newspaper reflected their time underwater (the newspaper had offices in the heart of the flooded area). In the course of the flood, the Arkansas left its course and relocated below the bluffs of South Pueblo. Local officials decided to prevent future flooding events and, with federal help, created the existing system of levees to hold the river in its new channel. The old channel became cooling ponds for a power plant, parking lots near City Hall, and, most prominently, the primary course of Elizabeth Street—one of the City’s major East-West streets. In 2000, the original river channel was reopened through the Historic Arkansas River Project—nearly 80 years after the 1921 flood.

The Pueblo Dam and Reservoir, part of a reclamation project serving the Arkansas and Fryingpan Rivers, was completed in the 1980s. This was the result of lobbying efforts by local leaders that began in 1939 and reached a turning point when President John Kennedy signed the Fryingpan-Arkansas approving legislation into law—marking the occasion with a subsequent visit to Pueblo. With this trans-mountain water source coupled with the local water system that owns facilities as far away as Leadville, the City acquired enough water to accommodate a population of over 300,000.

By 1948, the city limits of Pueblo had more than quadrupled, stretching north to include the neighborhoods known today as Northside, and much of Skyview and Country Club, east to Eastside/Lower Eastside, and west and south encompassing most of the Aberdeen, Bessemer (south), State Fair and Sunset Park neighborhood areas. Much of the area, which is reflected by a grid pattern street network, was platted around the turn of the century. These older platted areas were often acquired and built upon by individual property owners, which accounts for the diversity of architectural style in Pueblo’s older neighborhoods. Land situated on the City’s north and southwest periphery, although part of Pueblo in 1948, was predominantly developed in the 1950s and 1960s.

The decades of the 1950s and 1960s saw the largest population increase Pueblo has experienced. Approximately 34,000 new residents (many of which were post-war “baby boomers”) increased the demand for housing and services. The new housing development occurred primarily to the north (Country Club, Skyview, and Northside), east (Belmont) and southwest (Beulah Heights, Sunset Park, and Lake Minnequa). In many cases, these neighborhoods were different from their predecessors because they were primarily “tract housing” which is housing that is built by a developer and then sold to a buyer. As a result there is often less diversity in the architectural style of these newer neighborhoods. Pueblo continued to grow and
By the 1970s, development within the City of Pueblo saw a noticeable slow down; in the past 30 years, the City has only increased by 5,500 residents.

Since 1940, approximately 20 - 30% of Pueblo County’s population has resided outside the city of Pueblo. Number wise, this means a change from 16,700 people in 1940, to an estimated 35,400 in 1999.

Pueblo County has two “metro districts” which were formed in the 1960’s. The Pueblo West Metro District encompasses 49 square miles ... the Colorado City Metro District has a land area of 13 square miles.

By the 1970s, development within the City of Pueblo saw a noticeable slow down; in the past 30 years, the City has only increased by 5,500 residents.

By 1970, single-family development within the City of Pueblo began to see a noticeable slow down; population today reflects an increase of only 5,500 persons since it reached 97,770 in 1970. For the most part, development in Pueblo County has revolved around the growth of the City of Pueblo. However, there has always been a fairly large population living in unincorporated areas immediately outside the city limits, in the agricultural areas such as the St. Charles Mesa or in more remote areas such as Avondale, Boone, Rye, Beulah and the Metro Districts of Pueblo West and Colorado City. Since 1940, approximately 20 - 30% of Pueblo County’s population has resided outside the city of Pueblo. This has ranged from as few as 16,700 in 1940, to an estimated 35,400 in 1999. Recent unincorporated population growth (11,000 people) over the last decade (1990’s) has occurred primarily within the Pueblo West Metro District (discussed below) and the St. Charles Mesa.

Metro Districts

Pueblo County has two “metro districts” which were formed in the 1960’s. Metro Districts are service districts permitted by an act of the Colorado Legislature to provide municipal services such as street improvements, fire protection, recreation, and water and sewer services. They do not have the power to provide police services or zoning and subdivision. Pueblo County provides these services to residents of the Metro Districts.

The Pueblo West Metro District is located seven miles west of Pueblo along U.S. Highway 50. It was established in 1969 and encompasses 31,000 acres or 49 square miles (land area slightly larger than City of Pueblo) with 18,700 platted residential lots. The Colorado City Metro District is located approximately 20 miles south of the City along Interstate 25. This district was established in 1963 and encompasses 8,500 acres or 13 square miles subdivided into 16,800 lots.
Community Outreach

Many opportunities were provided for respective governmental units and citizens to influence the Regional Development Plan. Community outreach meetings, newspaper articles and community event surveys were a few of the tools used throughout the Region to measure community views on growth and the environment. These feedback tools were repeated at various stages of the Plan’s development.

Public Facilitation Meetings

As part of the overall citizen participation process for the Plan, a series of Community Facilitation Sessions were held during the first part of the planning process (Winter 1999). This most dynamic source of public outreach was held during the Regional Plan Kick-off Week. Seven sessions, three in the city and four in the County, provided an opportunity for citizens to express opinions about growth and development. Specifically the work sessions allowed citizens to:

- Identify the Region’s strong points and things to be enhanced;
- Identify issues related to growth and development of residential, commercial, and industrial uses, as well as transportation and infrastructure;
- Determine what outside events were affecting or could affect the community’s future such as changes in federal programs, development of new roadways or expanded job opportunities, etc.; and,
- Propose some elements of a vision for the community.

What follows is a summary of those ideas presented by citizens at the community facilitation sessions. Citizen groups were asked to choose the most important item in each of fourteen categories. The list of fourteen topical areas is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Issues</th>
<th>Development Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location/Direction of Growth</td>
<td>Drainage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhoods</td>
<td>Rural Subdivisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Centers</td>
<td>Agricultural Preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Character</td>
<td>Open Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Facilities</td>
<td>Demographic Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Facilities</td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Facilities</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many opportunities were provided for respective governmental units and citizens to influence the final product of the Plan. Community outreach meetings, newspaper articles and community event surveys were a few of the tools used.
Responses from both the City of Pueblo and unincorporated Pueblo County were received and compiled to develop the following summary, which is listed in priority order.

**Why do you like living in the Pueblo area?**
- Moderate climate
- Quality of life – small town atmosphere, agriculture feel, slow pace
- People of Community – friendly, honest, diverse, civic-minded
- Abundant water supply
- Open Space – beauty and proximity
- Natural Resources/Environment – clean air and mountains/plains
- Low Cost of Living - affordable housing, land availability
- Rural/Agriculture – diversified, excellent soil and water for farms
- Freedom to use property without excess regulation

**Physical changes identified ranged from transportation improvements to agricultural preservation.**

**What physical changes would you like to see in the Pueblo area?**
- Transportation system improvements – improved roadway maintenance, improved roads in Pueblo West and access to the southside, introduction of light rail, bus line improvements with times/frequencies, improved northside transportation, improvement of pedestrian and bike access, bridge improvements/maintenance, and provision of air service to Pueblo;
- Infrastructure improvements - drainage facilities to prevent flooding/need stricter standards, and expansion of utility service, especially water and sewer service, utility consolidation, and need for more sophisticated electronic infrastructure;
- Agricultural preservation - loss of agriculture lands, limiting proliferation of 5 - 40 acre tracts in rural areas, create incentives to preserve as farms, maintain rural area and encourage agriculture lifestyle and right to farm;
- Economic development - higher paying jobs for area residents, diverse industry with potential for growth of employment;
- Planning – limiting urban sprawl, better enforcement of zoning regulations, address undesirable land uses such as junk yards and old industrial sites, managed growth, providing higher development standards, protecting additional open space;
- Recreational opportunities - neighborhood park maintenance and expansion with new developments;
- Attractive community - restore old buildings, change the image of old buildings/clean up, develop beautification programs, encourage green builders - i.e., architectural conditions, fireproofs, provide tax credits for upgrade of neighborhoods, rid city of negative images, create more attractive entrances into Pueblo on Highway's 50 & I-25; and,
- Environmental concerns - high water tables, septic system pollution of wells, impact on natural ecosystems, preservation of natural ground cover, and relationship of future development to natural hazards such as flooding.
What is your vision for the future of the Pueblo area?

- Character of Pueblo maintained and preservation of natural setting and cultural history while allowing for economic growth
- Well planned and maintained infrastructure and public services
- Efficient/multi-modal transportation system serving all citizens
- Strong interconnected neighborhoods with all services and activities
- Strong and diverse job market and viable downtown
- Well-planned and attractive community, particularly in older areas
- Pedestrian and bike ways or greenways that connect neighborhoods
- Maintain natural beauty, while still allowing reasonable and rational growth
- Intimate rural setting will be maintained with thoughtful planning
- Continued preservation of open space and agricultural land
- Recreational facilities that meet the full lifecycle of all citizens

Regional Plan Public Opinion Survey

As part of the community outreach effort for the Pueblo Regional Development Plan, a survey was distributed that asked questions related to growth and development in the Region. Excellent response was received, with over 400 people completing the survey while attending the annual Chili and Frijole Festival (September 1999) and the Plan Alternative Meetings (October 1999). Of the respondents, 71% lived within the City of Pueblo, 12% in Pueblo West, 6% in St. Charles Mesa, and the remainder in other areas of Pueblo County.

Survey Responses

These responses have been broken down into four areas of interest: managing growth, location of commercial and industrial development, landscaping and signage, and protection of agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands.

Managing growth

- Statement 1 - Local government should take the initiative to guide growth within the Pueblo Region: 94% responded positively, with 51% of the respondents strongly agreeing.
- Statement 2 - Private developers and the market should determine future growth in the Pueblo Region: Only 37% agreed, with 63% taking the opposing view (split almost evenly between strongly disagree and disagree).
Location of commercial and industrial development

- **Statement 3** - Commercial development should be concentrated in planned areas, rather than the current tendency to occur as strip development along I-25 and major roadways: 79% respondents agreed (split almost evenly between strongly agree and agree).

- **Statement 4** - More strip commercial development along I-25 and major roadways benefit the Pueblo Region: 54% disagreed that strip commercial was beneficial, while 46% agree. The view that strip commercial was not beneficial was more strongly felt in areas outside the city of Pueblo (over 60% of the respondents from outside the city disagreed that strip commercial was beneficial to the Region, while 48% disagreed in the city).

Landscaping and signage

- **Statement 5** - Landscaping should be required to improve the look of commercial and industrial development: An overwhelming number, 94%, of the respondents agreed, with only a minor 6% disagreeing.

- **Statement 6** - New commercial and industrial development should not be required to provide landscaping: 83% of the respondents disagreed, with more than half of this number registering a strong disagreement.

- **Statement 7** - Limiting the size and number of signs improves the look of commercial and industrial development: 88% strongly agreed this was a way of improving the look of the area and only 12% disagreed (only 3% strongly disagreed).

- **Statement 8** - Large and/or numerous signs are necessary to properly advertise commercial and industrial business: 81% of the respondents felt it unnecessary for commercial and industrial businesses to use very large or numerous signs to effectively advertise.

Protection of agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands

- **Statement 9** - Programs should be developed to protect productive agricultural land, flood plains, wildlife habitats and environmentally sensitive land: an overwhelming 96% of the respondents agreed, with 64% strongly agreeing.

- **Statement 10** - I would be willing to pay 5 cents a day to fund programs to protect productive agricultural land, flood plains, wildlife habitats and environmentally sensitive land: 77% respondents agreed, with only 7% of the opposing view strongly disagreeing.

Overall Survey Response

Respondents strongly supported local government taking the initiative to guide growth in the Region and disagreed that the private sector should have this responsibility. There was strong support for concentrating commercial and industrial development in planned areas, and only moderate acknowledgment that strip commercial development benefits the Pueblo Region. An overwhelming number agreed that landscaping would improve the look of commercial and industrial development and felt it should be required for new development. This opinion also held true for limiting the size and number of signs. In the area of protecting agriculture, flood plains, wildlife habitats and other environmentally sensitive lands, there was very strong support. Likewise, most respondents expressed a willingness to pay 5
cents a day to fund programs to protect these properties. Positive responses to the last two statements were received from people regardless of where they lived in the Region.

Community Interviews

At the beginning of the planning process PACOG staff arranged meetings with numerous local, state and federal agencies in the Pueblo Region. Many agencies and departments took the time to prepare briefing papers outlining past, present and future activities. Information collected from the consultant’s personal interviews of approximately 50 groups and individuals who were active in key programs or positions within the community, provided a wealth of planning related information. Key information that provided vital direction for the Plan is summarized below.

Pueblo 2010 Commission

The Pueblo 2010 Commission’s Strategic Plan presents overarching visions that address a broad range of components of the community, including arts and culture, business and economic development, environment, governance, historic preservation, infrastructure, education, and recreation.

Pueblo Economic Development Corporation (PEDCo)

PEDCo is the Pueblo Region’s primary economic development organization. PEDCo provides information about Pueblo, including climate, air quality, neighborhoods, government, industrial parks, education, population, cost of living, housing, etc. to prospective employers.

Flooding and fire protection

The 100-year flood plain represents a reasonable boundary for most planning and development purposes; however, certain “critical facilities” should remain outside of the 500-year flood plain, unless significant efforts are made to flood proof the proposed facility.

There are fifteen fire districts covering rural areas in Pueblo County. Approximately two-thirds of the County is within the Pueblo Emergency Response team’s area that provides wildfire protection only – no structural fire protection. The increase in rural subdivisions, containing lots of 35-acres or greater, is often in these areas. There is a desire for the Regional Plan to, in most cases, require the provision of full service fire protection when and where new development occurs.

School overcrowding

School District 70, generally serving areas outside the City of Pueblo, completed a demographic study in 1998. Pueblo West has been growing at a rate of 400 to 500 students per year for the past three to four years. They desperately need building sites. The District is getting close to capacity, including the district office and the school bus storage facility. District 70 has the lowest per pupil operating revenue in the State, while being one of the fastest growing districts in the State.

Fountain Creek Watershed protection

Protecting the Fountain Creek Watershed is a regional effort. PACOG and the Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments have organized to recognize the Fountain Creek Watershed as a regional asset supporting diverse interests. The parties strive to maintain or restore the Creek’s health and its tributaries.
The Water Board has enough water rights to serve approximately 360,000 people along with “associated growth.”

The St. Charles Mesa is currently not served with sanitary sewer; however, a sewer district has been formed and a funding plan is being put together to provide sanitary sewer to the area.

The Division of Wildlife is particularly concerned about increased “40-acre hobby farms” and their impact on the environmentally sensitive southwestern portion of the County.

Water service
The Pueblo Board of Water Works, created by City charter, has a five member independent board elected at-large in the City. The extraterritorial water service areas, Permit Areas A and B, were created by City ordinance. Permit Area A is that area within the City of Pueblo and immediately surrounding the City limits. In general, this covers the area that is expected to develop at urban or suburban densities with associated commercial and industrial development. Permit Area B consists of the rest of the County and any adjacent counties. Prior to extending water to a property in Permit Area A or B, the Water Board requests comments from both the City and County. Either may request that conditions be imposed. The Ordinance requires that a property owner in either Permit Area agree to annex in the future when the property becomes legally “annexable.” All City conditions are binding in Permit Area A and advisory in Permit Area B. All County conditions are advisory in either area. The Board of Water Works has full discretion over water system improvements, with no City control.

The Water Board has enough water rights to serve approximately 360,000 people along with “associated growth” (i.e., related commercial and industrial growth based on the general historic proportion of residential to commercial and industrial). Approximately 105,000 people are currently served. The water treatment plant currently has a capacity of approximately 63,000,000 gallons per day serving 105,000 persons. An additional 21,000,000 per day capacity will be added totaling 84,000,000 gallons per day.

The St. Charles Mesa Water District currently serves a population of 3,600. There are ample improvements in the planning stage including continued completion of loops and small main replacement, raw waterline replacement, construction of a 2.5 million gallon water storage tank for treated water, which will double storage capacity, raw water pump and main extension, increase in raw water storage, and the improvement of a filter plant. While the St. Charles Mesa is currently not served with sanitary sewer, a sewer district has been formed and a funding plan is being put together to provide sanitary sewer to the area.

Environmental concerns
The Greenway and Nature Center of Pueblo identified the following environmental needs: provide parks and trailways; provide undeveloped open space; preserve ecologically sound agricultural activities and the areas associated with them; preserve river corridors, wetlands, and buffer zones; protect the Teepee Butte area, Arkansas River Bluffs, and the Graneros Gorge; and implement the Pueblo Natural Resource and Environmental Education Council’s plans. The Division of Wildlife works on a day-to-day basis with owners of property to regulate, enhance and manage wildlife resources. The Division provides comments and recommendations concerning how to mitigate impacts from development on riparian corridors. It is particularly concerned about increased “40-acre hobby farms” and their impact on the environmentally sensitive southwestern portion of the County. The Division attempts to remain very “balanced” recognizing both the wildlife preservation issues and the development issues. It feels that this “balance” could best be achieved by developing a County open space policy.

Protection of property rights
The Farm Bureau is concerned with the protection of property rights. They recognize this as a “two edge sword” in that there is a desire to protect farmers from the encroachment of development while also allowing farmers to recoup their investment in the farm by selling property for development. Farmers and ranchers noted that capital gains taxes and inheritance taxes often force property to be sold for development. Most feel that the only way to preserve farmland and ranchland is to make sure that the areas to be protected are compensated. Conservation easements are viable, but tools available to finance them are limited. Programs do exist which can help the farmer and rancher. The Colorado Cattlemen’s Assn. has a program to generate dollars for land preservation. Other programs provide farmers and ranchers with financial incentives for conservation easements on their property.
Development issues in unincorporated Pueblo County

St. Charles Mesa Development Constraints - Constraints to growth and development within the St. Charles Mesa include the area’s high groundwater table and lack of sanitary sewer. These constraints are substantially impacting new residential subdivisions being developed at much greater densities (half acre to one acre lots) than the previous large acreage (10 to 40 acres) characteristic of this area when it was predominantly a farming community. Compounding this problem is the reduction of ground water uses for agricultural farming purposes.

Rural Subdivisions – The growth of large-lot rural subdivisions (40-acre rural lots) significantly impacts Pueblo County’s ability to maintain its rural roadway system. Residents living in these rural subdivisions often place increased pressure upon the County to improve dirt roads winding throughout their subdivisions. This problem is particularly acute in older subdivision plats where roads were never constructed yet lots were sold and developed.

Bicycle routes and recreation trails

Several agencies expressed a keen interest in maintaining and expanding the ongoing bike and greenway system.

Summary of Community Issues

Throughout the process of listening to public and community leaders through surveys and interviews, a significant number of land use issues were raised. Many of these issues related to mobility, such as the lack of connectivity from one area of the region to the other, traffic congestion or the lack of pedestrian-friendly transportation systems. Other concerns included land use conflicts between residential and commercial, redevelopment of older areas within the City of Pueblo, and the suburbanization of rural areas. Also, issues frequently raised by citizens included the economy, and overcrowding within the school system in fast-growing suburban areas.

The following key issues were identified through the public outreach efforts.

Land Use – general
- Lack of economic vitality
- Future development along Pueblo Boulevard
- Urbanization in the St. Charles Mesa (agricultural and infrastructure conflicts)

Land Use – commercial/industrial
- Strip commercial along major roadways
- Deterioration of businesses in older commercial areas
- Redevelopment of older commercial and industrial areas
- Maintenance of neighborhood character

Rural Subdivisions – The growth of large-lot rural subdivisions (40-acre rural lots) significantly impacts Pueblo County’s ability to maintain its rural roadway system.
Land Use Issues ...

Downtown – Rehabilitation and revitalization, particularly within industrial sites

Residential – Aging residential; lack of neighborhood maintenance and code enforcement

Pueblo West – High population growth and increased demand for schools, water and sewer

Schools – Closures in older residential areas and overcrowding in fast growing suburban locations

Transportation – Lack of cross-town access and street connectivity; one-way streets detract from residential character

Land Use – Downtown
- Rehabilitation and revitalization, particularly within industrial sites
- Removal of obstacles to residential development
- Development of technological infrastructure within the downtown
- Management and maintenance of downtown

Land Use - Residential
- Commercial encroachment and poor transition in uses
- Light and sound from commercial areas
- Poor condition of multi-family dwellings
- Aging residential; lack of neighborhood maintenance and code enforcement
- Residential conversions to rental properties and multi-family in close proximity to single-family
- Feeling neighborhoods are unsafe, thus diminished investment
- Neighborhood preservation, rehabilitation of older housing, and lack of rehabilitation code standards
- Poor in-fill development – modular housing lacking compatible design character

Metro Districts
- High population growth in Pueblo West and increased demand for schools, water and sewer
- Lack of adequate commercial land in Colorado City

School Districts
- School closures
- Lack of link to community
- Overcrowding in fast growing suburban locations

Infrastructure
- Lack of sewer service
- High water table
- Poor drainage

Transportation
- Lack of cross-town access and access to downtown core
- Lack of street connectivity & one-way streets detract from residential character
- Impact of I-25 corridor on neighborhoods
- Lack of pedestrian-friendly streets
- Impact of through traffic on neighborhoods
- Street extensions bisecting neighborhoods
- At grade railroad crossings
Landscaping/Aesthetics
- Lack of vegetation in new developments
- Poor signage and landscaping in commercial areas
- Loss of mountain views

Recreation
- Uneven distribution of park facilities
- Lack of smaller parks, poor maintenance of facilities in some areas of the City

Agricultural Preservation
- Concern over loss of prime agricultural land
- Maintaining agricultural and ranching operations and preserving open space
- Selling off of water rights outside the County

Rural Issues
- Lack of water availability in rural subdivisions
- Rural levels of public services (fire, sheriff, EMS, etc.)
- Wildlife corridor disturbance
- Conflict between mineral extraction and nearby residential
Factual Foundation

Land Demand Analysis

A key component to planning for the Pueblo Region’s future is developing realistic forecasts for future demand for residential and nonresidential growth. Estimating the amount of land needed to accommodate new residential, commercial, industrial and public uses between now and the planning horizon of the Plan – a population of 200,000 – is referred to as a Demand Analysis.

This analysis estimates future land demand in three broad categories:

- Residential uses, including single-family houses, duplexes/townhouse and multi-family units needed to accommodate future household growth.
- Nonresidential uses, such as retail stores, offices and industries needed to accommodate future employment growth.
- Public sector land needs for parks and schools.

The Demand Analysis projects an “excess” of more land for future land uses than the market will actually absorb. This provides a sufficient number of alternative development sites and makes allowances for some sites not fully developing (site inefficiency). The information that follows is excerpted from the Demand Analysis Technical Memorandum, completed in spring 1999 and updated based on plan review comments in Spring 2001. This technical memorandum provides a full discussion of the land demand methodology, copies of which are available at PACOG.

Population Trends

Pueblo County’s population growth over the past three decades (1970 – 2000) has not followed a consistent growth pattern. In 1975, following several decades of growth, the County’s population peaked at almost 126,700. The recession of the mid 1980’s saw a loss in population that was not recovered until 1994, almost 20 years later. As seen in Table 1, year 2000 population estimates place Pueblo County’s population at 140,000 people. Information provided by the Demand Analysis, indicates that Pueblo County’s population will reach approximately 200,000 in year 2030.

The percent of County population that is projected to reside within the City of Pueblo through year 2030 is also shown in Table 1. Up to the 1990’s, the City’s share of the County’s population remained around 80 – 82% due to most new housing development occurring within the City of Pueblo. However, the 1990’s saw a significant change in this trend due to substantial development occurring within Pueblo West and other unincorporated areas of the County.

By 2030, Pueblo County’s population is projected to reach 200,000: approximately 124,000 will live within the City of Pueblo.
Based on single-family building permits, from 1990 to 2000, the City of Pueblo captured 32% of the new home starts, while Pueblo West captured 56% and other areas of the County captured 12%. However, the last two years of the 1990’s, has seen an upswing in single-family housing development within the City, due to development of land already within the City and annexation of developing areas.

To better reflect this strong development trend recently occurring within the City, the Demand Analysis’s population projections for the City were increased to reflect a population growth capture rate for the City of 35% of the County’s projected 59,800 new residents over the next 30 years, which results in a population increase in the City of 20,950 people.

Overall, Table 1 indicates that the City’s percentage of the County’s total population will continue to decline over the next 30 years due to a significant number of new home starts occurring outside the City.

### Housing Trends

The population projections discussed above provide the foundation to forecast the demand for new residential development through year 2030. Table 2 summarizes this housing trend analysis. The detailed trend analysis and methodology for projecting new residential growth by housing type is contained in the Demand Analysis Technical Memorandum.

Based on the information in the table below, 81% of the 30,100 new residential units developed over the next 30 years are projected to be single-family residential units. These projections are based on current development trends and may change as buyer preferences change. Using information from the population projections shown above, it can be assumed that about two-thirds of all new housing units will be built outside the City of Pueblo.
Table 2 – Pueblo Regional Housing Growth, 1998 – 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family Units</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>7,669</td>
<td>8,010</td>
<td>7,065</td>
<td>24,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex/Townhouse Units</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>1,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family Units</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>1,249</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>9,475</td>
<td>9,896</td>
<td>8,729</td>
<td>30,102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Demand Analysis Technical Memorandum

Employment Trends

In addition to residential growth, another component of growth is economic-employment change. Projecting future employment assists in determining the demand for future non-residential land. Table 3 provides estimates for total public and private sector jobs for Pueblo County from 1997 to 2030.

Table 3 – Pueblo Regional Job Growth, 1997 – 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1997 – 2030 Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1997</td>
<td></td>
<td>2030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>66,027</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>139,289</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>73,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Demand Analysis Technical Memorandum

Over the next 30 years, 2001 to 2030, 30,100 new dwelling units will be built in the Pueblo Region.

In 1997, Pueblo Region had 66,027 jobs. During the 30-year planning horizon, job growth is expected to more than double, rising to 139,000 jobs.

The table combines an estimate of the number of jobs held by residents with commuting patterns in and out of the County. The total number of jobs in Pueblo County is based on projections to 2025 by the Colorado De-
partment of Local Affairs and projected to 2030 by The Burnham Group. Based on these projections, the “service sector” will be the largest gainer in job growth, adding over 31,000, followed by 18,700 new retail trade jobs. Overall, it is projected there will be over 73,000 new jobs created in the 33-year time span. It may be noted that a large “percent” gain is shown for the category of “agriculture/mining.” Although there is an estimated increase of 1,100 employees in this category, the overall employment projections for this sector as a percent of total employment is expected to continue to decline. This employment sector includes not only traditional agricultural and mining activities, but also includes veterinarians, horticultural services, forestry services and fishery and hunting services, and anyone employed in managing such things as horses, bees and poultry. The mining sector also includes the extraction of nonmetallic minerals such as stone and sand.

**Park Land Trends**

The need for public parks relies heavily on the adoption of local standards for park land acreages to serve the resident population, along with standards for specific recreation facilities such as ball fields, tennis courts and passive recreation areas. Information provided in the Demand Analysis Technical Memorandum, relied on national standards applied against the projected population increase discussed earlier. Collectively, the typical national standards for neighborhood, community and district parks suggest a total of 7.0 acres per 1,000 persons; this does not include park land acreage in greenways. Whether the local strategy is to provide small, decentralized neighborhood park facilities or to centralize parks by providing large park facilities serving broad areas, the 7.0 acres per 1,000 persons generally holds for city and county-funded facilities.

The City of Pueblo currently owns 767 acres of developed parks (urban, district and neighborhood parks). This equates to about 7.5 acres per 1,000 persons given the City’s population of 103,000, or a park land “surplus” of 46 acres. Although it appears there is a surplus of park land in the City of Pueblo, much of this acreage is contained in neighborhood parks. The City continues to have a need for more district sized recreation areas.

Pueblo County has a total of 166 acres of park land. This includes parkland owned by the County (65 acres), Pueblo West (53 acres), Colorado City (35 acres), Beulah (3 acres), and Rye (10 acres). Given that approximately 37,000 persons live in the County, this equates to 4.5 acres of park land per 1,000 persons, or a deficit of 93 acres. Reduced amount of park acreage available to County residents may not be as great a concern, since many residents living outside the City of Pueblo often have much greater open space available to them.

By the year 2030, when the population of Pueblo County is projected to reach 200,000 persons, the area will have added almost 60,000 people – 20,950 in the City and 39,909 in the County. Based on population growth in the City of Pueblo, there will be an additional park land demand of 100 acres (based on a standard of 7 acres per 1,000 persons and subtracting the 46 acre surplus). In the County, the 39,909 additional people will generate...
an additional park land demand of 279 acres. Adding the County’s 279-acre future park land need to its existing 93-acre deficit, results in a park land demand of 372 acres. Folding in the City’s 100-acre future park land needs, results in a total park land demand of 472 acres by year 2030. Of the additional acres needed to meet future population growth, the type of recreation facilities may vary considerably based on the population areas served. Whereas the more densely developed urban areas of the city may have a need for neighborhood level parks within walking distance of homes, the less densely populated areas of the County may find the large district parks better serve their needs.

It should be recognized that using national standards based purely on acreage, does not consider the adequacy of existing facilities nor the fact that a few large acreage sites can “skew” the total acres. In addition, park land may not be evenly distributed throughout the community, thus some areas may actually be underserved, even though the national acreage standards are met on a community-wide basis. A regional recreation study is currently being prepared.

Public School Trends

Pueblo County is served by two public school districts: District No. 60 covering the City of Pueblo, and District No. 70 covering the remainder of the county. There are also a few private schools within the county. Since population projections by age are not available separately for the city and the county, future demand for new school acreage was addressed in the Demand Analysis Technical Memorandum on a countywide basis, and included students enrolled in private schools (5.5% of total enrollment).

Based on the information provided in the Demand Analysis, there were 25,964 students enrolled in public and private schools. By 2030, it is projected that enrollment will rise to 34,333 students. To obtain future school acreage needs, student-per-acre standards are divided into the increase in student population through 2030. These standards compare favorably with national standards; actual local school standards may vary from these.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 – Pueblo Regional New School Acres – 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrollment Increase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools (Grades K – 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Schools (Grades 6 – 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools (Grades 9 – 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Demand Analysis Technical Memorandum
The land demand figures for schools should be used with caution. The figures do not consider the absorption of future students into schools that have current excess capacity, or the inefficient provision of new schools to serve a dispersed population; nor do they consider the shift in location of student concentrations. Enrollments have been falling in District 60 for the past several years, while enrollments in District 70 have been skyrocketing. Overall, District 60 projects a continuation of falling enrollments (although by less than 2%) for the next 5 years due to a combination of factors, including an aging existing population base, compounded by family relocations from the city to the suburbs (principally Pueblo West). To the extent that the school-aged population shifts disproportionately to School District 70 in the future, actual acreage demands for new schools in that district will be greater than the “net” amounts estimated in Table 4 above.

**Future Land Demand Summary**

The preceding sections provided year 2030 projections for population, housing, and employment growth and projected demand for additional park land and school sites. Table 5 below summarizes the projected land demand needed to accommodate an additional 60,000 residents and 73,000 jobs by 2030. The net acres shown in the first column are actual acres needed to accommodate future growth. However, for the purposes of developing the Pueblo Regional Development Plan, these acreages need to be expanded to account for “inefficiencies” in the land development process (efficiency multiplier), and for the uncertainty as to which precise lands will be developed (market choice multiplier). This results in the gross land demand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Demand</th>
<th>Net Land Demand (Acres)</th>
<th>Efficiency Multiplier</th>
<th>Market Choice Multiplier</th>
<th>Gross Land Demand (Acres)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family 24,364 units</td>
<td>8,121</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex/Townhse. 1,938 units</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family 3,800 units</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial 14,624,730 sf</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 7,830,026 sf</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial 4,360,068 sf</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gov't. Adm. 2,574,450 sf</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Land</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,744</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31,082</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Demand Analysis Technical Memorandum
The “efficiency multiplier” recognizes that, during the land development process, some lands are vacant but irrevocably dedicated to development in that particular land use category. For instance, a single-family subdivision will contain vacant lots throughout development until the subdivision is 100% built out. A shopping center may contain spin sites and an industrial park may contain pad sites, all graded and ready for development, but vacant nonetheless. The “efficiency multiplier” accounts for this type of development practice. The efficiency multiplier also recognizes that some land use developments, such as industrial parks, are generally built with comparatively more vacant sites (50% efficiency multiplier), than is seen in development such as multi-family complex (10% efficiency multiplier).

The “market choice multiplier” differs notably from the “efficiency multiplier” in that it relates directly to the uncertainty of “in which market” will a particular property be developed. For example, a particular Region may contain 1,000 acres, but only 400 are expected to develop within the planning horizon. The market place multiplier presents two problems: 1) identifying the 400 acres is not clear, and 2) the total 1,000 acres may be appropriate for development for that particular land use. Thus, more acres will normally be shown on the Regional Development Plan than the actual acres expected to be developed. This allows the market to choose the appropriate sites within the appropriate areas identified for the use. The market choice multiplier also varies according to land use type, reflecting the level of “certainty” that one may have about the variety of appropriate locations for each use.

The result of applying the “efficiency” and the “market choice” multipliers, increase the total net land demand from 12,700 acres to 31,300 gross land demand acres. Land use types use the gross land demand acres to ensure that the Plan has sufficient land designated for future growth.

Land Capacity Analysis

The “Land Demand Analysis” above reviewed the land demand created by future growth. This section summarizes the “Growth Capacity Analysis Technical Memorandum.” The land capacity analysis examines the capacity of the Region's vacant land to accommodate this additional development. This analysis of the Region’s available land (vacant land) is based on how the land is currently zoned. This determines how much future development can be built on existing vacant land as it is currently zoned.

The “Growth Capacity Analysis” is not where future growth will occur; it is a window into how much development can be handled under current land development regulations (zoning). A demand forecast, coupled with a capacity analysis, provides elected officials, citizens and planners with data necessary to discuss future policy matters concerning such issues as development densities and location, availability of and impact on water, sewer and schools, as well as a host of other policies that affect the quality of life in the Region.
Current Growth Capacity

The Pueblo Region has a growth capacity of 1,225,550 vacant, developable acres (1,915 square miles or three-fourths of the Region’s 2,400 square miles). This is vacant land unconstrained by environmental factors such as steep slopes, flood plains, rivers or land in public ownership such as right-of-ways, parks, depots, national forest, etc. (see Methodology, “Growth Capacity Analysis Technical Memorandum”). The growth capacity includes land that is in active agricultural use and is not necessarily available for development. But because there are currently few limitations on agricultural lands being converted to “developed urban” acres, they were included in the growth capacity acres.

Comparing Capacity with Demand

Table 6 compares available land capacity with the demand for land to accommodate projected growth. In 1998, based on existing zoning and typical development densities (see Methodology, “Growth Capacity Analysis Technical Memorandum”), the Pueblo Region’s vacant land had the growth capacity to accommodate 89,443 new dwelling units and 72,025 new jobs. This is a sufficient amount of land to accommodate year 2030 projected demand that is 30,102 new dwelling units and 73,262 new jobs.

Table 6 – 1998 Capacity Versus 2030 Demand

Clearly there is more than adequate vacant, developable land for future dwelling units and sufficient land to accommodate most of the growth in employment throughout the Region through year 2030. The most important question then becomes: Where is the capacity located?

Location of Growth Capacity

As illustrated in Table 7, in 1998, there was sufficient capacity in the Region to accommodate 89,500 new residential units and 72,000 new jobs. Approximately half of the residential capacity is located in the City of Pueblo and the Metro Districts (a vacant land capacity of 45,300 dwelling units). This is more than enough capacity to accommodate the projected
dwellling unit demand of 30,100 new dwellings (discussed in the “Demand Analysis” above).

Table 7 – Location of Available Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Capacity for New Dwellings</th>
<th>Residential Capacity Percent</th>
<th>Capacity for New Jobs</th>
<th>Employment Capacity Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Pueblo</td>
<td>14,500 units</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30,500 jobs</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo West Metro</td>
<td>17,000 units</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18,300 jobs</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado City Metro</td>
<td>13,800 units</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3,600 jobs</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Areas/Small Towns</td>
<td>44,200 units</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>19,600 jobs</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>89,500 units</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>72,000 jobs</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The dwelling and employment capacity figures shown for the City of Pueblo are very conservative given two reasons. As the City annexes new land, it expands its development capacity. Secondly, there are two urban-level developments within the City of Pueblo, Eagleridge and SouthPointe, that have been master planned but are currently zoned as low density A-1 Agriculture. If developed as planned, they would increase the City’s dwelling unit capacity by over 7,000 units and provide a number of employment opportunities.

Unfortunately, almost 49% of the Region’s remaining residential capacity (44,200 dwelling units) is located in unincorporated areas or small rural communities on land that is zoned for agricultural use. Again, “capacity” is vacant, environmentally unconstrained land zoned either for residential or employment uses. Since agriculturally zoned land permits residential development, it was included in the “residential” capacity. Unfortunately, there was not an efficient method for documenting agriculturally zoned land that was not being used for agricultural purposes from actively used agricultural land; therefore, all land zoned agriculture was included in the capacity analysis.

The location of employment capacity, although not as great a contrast as that seen in the residential capacity, is interesting to examine. Fortunately, over two-thirds (68%) of the employment capacity is located in the City of Pueblo or in Pueblo West. Available capacity in these areas is typically well served by public facilities and an urban street network. Only 27% of the capacity for future employment is located in more rural areas of the Region.

Impact on rural areas

The total amount of unconstrained, vacant agricultural land in the Region exceeds 1.2 million acres. Based on the “Capacity Analysis,” if the Region were to fully develop as currently zoned, a layer of low density residential would cover much of the Region’s agricultural areas. Development in this manner would consume land at a rate of 180 times that of more urban densities. The infrastructure costs associated with this low density de-
development would be a significant cost to the Region in the provision and/or maintenance of roadways, water lines and police and fire protection. This is in addition to the potential impact on agricultural uses and wildlife.

The potential for so much low density development is a result of agricultural zoning which permits residential development on parcels from a half acre to 40 acres or larger. In addition, State of Colorado statutes permit land of 35 acres or greater to be subdivided with no public improvements being provided.

Capacity and Water Service

Another component of the capacity analysis is the availability of public water. The “Capacity Analysis” examined water service areas of the Pueblo Board of Water Works, Pueblo West, Colorado City, St. Charles Mesa and some smaller districts. Based on this analysis, 44% of the dwelling unit capacity (39,000 dwelling units) is located outside areas presently served by public water service. As stated earlier, a significant amount of the residential capacity is located in areas actively used for agricultural purposes. There is little likelihood that much of this land will actually be developed for residential use; therefore, public water service is not seen as a critical issue. However, in recent years, large tracts of agricultural land in these unserved areas have been subdivided into 35-plus acre tracts for residential purposes. This raises the issue of the availability of public water service in more rural areas. In addition to the issue of residential development, 22% of the employment growth capacity (16,000 jobs) is also located on land outside public water service areas.

Capacity and School Districts

Residential development has a tremendous impact on school districts in any geographical area. By overlaying the existing School District boundaries onto the vacant, developable lands map (capacity), the potential impact of residential development within these districts was determined. Based on the available residential capacity to accommodate 89,443 additional dwelling units, at full build out, the Region’s population would reach 350,000 people. This would result in a projected 34,883 additional students, most of which would be located in School District 70. This is substantially longer range than the Plan’s “planning horizon” for a population of 200,000 that would add an estimated 8,300 students by year 2030. Nevertheless, the potential for strong residential growth in rural areas could have a substantial impact on educational services. If this growth capacity were to occur as permitted by the present zoning, the ability to provide increased educational facilities in remote areas of the Region would become difficult.
Capacity and Impact on Wildlife Areas

Growth and development impact can have either a small or significant impact on wildlife habitats of a Region. As part of the "Capacity Analysis," an overlay was developed using the Pueblo Natural Resource and Environmental Education Strategic Plan that ranks wildlife habitats in order of significance. This habitat overlay was combined with the potential development capacity within the Region to determine the potential impact of development on these wildlife habitats. As Table 8 indicates, the majority of the growth capacity for both residential and employment is in the lower ranked or less sensitive wildlife habitats. Seventy four percent (74%) of the dwelling unit capacity and 81% of the employment capacity were in the 0 – 3 wildlife ranked areas. However, there remains 27% of the dwelling unit capacity and 19% of the employment capacity located in the top most sensitive wildlife areas.

Table 8 – Capacity within Ranked Wildlife Habitats

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensitivity Ranking</th>
<th>Dwellings and Employment</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 3</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>65,311</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>58,513</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 to 5</td>
<td>Dwelling Units</td>
<td>24,132</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>13,512</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Growth Capacity Analysis Technical Memorandum
Summary of Capacity and Demand

- The year 2000 population of the Pueblo Region is estimated at 140,000 people. By year 2030, it is projected the Region’s population will reach 200,000 (an additional 60,000 people).

- The forecasted population growth will add an estimated 30,100 dwelling units by 2030, a 50% increase over the existing number of residential units currently within the Region.

- Based on historic residential land use demand, additional residential development over the next 30 years will have a gross land demand of 21,270 acres (33 square miles).

- The Region may add over 73,000 new jobs over the next 30 years, a 100% increase over existing employment.

- Job growth will occur in commercial, office, industrial, and government land uses and will have a gross land demand of 9,790 acres (15 square miles).

- Of the Pueblo Region’s 2,400 square miles, over 1900 square miles are classified as vacant and environmentally unconstrained; this includes a considerable amount of active agricultural land.

- The vacant land capacity (under current zoning classifications) can accommodate 89,500 additional dwelling units and 72,000 additional jobs. This is more than enough vacant land for residential development and an adequate amount of land for most of the employment demand. The capacity to accommodate additional land for residential purposes is somewhat inflated because it contains land that is currently in productive agricultural uses and thus not actually available for development.

- Trends show an increase in the percentage of persons occupying lands in unincorporated Pueblo County.

- Trends show an increase in the percentage of persons occupying lands in unincorporated Pueblo County (38% in 2030 v. 26% in 2000). This translates into a trend that two-thirds of the future housing development will occur outside the City of Pueblo's corporate limits.

- Existing rural subdivisions such as Hatchet Ranch, Midway, Red Creek Ranch, and Signal Mountain consume 48,000 acres, and if fully developed (1 unit per 60 acres), they would add over 800 dwelling units in the rural areas. Land use densities of rural subdivisions currently consume land at a rate of 180 times that of urban development (1 unit per 60 acres compared to 3 units per acre in the urban area).
Regional Development Plan

Plan Overview

Previous sections of the Plan have reviewed the history of the Region, the Plan’s community outreach efforts, community issues and the Region’s capacity and demand for development. These sections serve as the historical, factual and perspective foundation for the Regional Development Plan. The Regional Development Plan synthesizes this information into four Plan components: 1) The Plan’s Guiding Principles, 2) Development Action Areas, 3) Future Land Use, and 4) Regional Transportation Plan.

- **Regional Plan Guiding Principles:** This establishes the Plan’s overarching goals and objectives related to future regional needs, urban needs, rural needs, neighborhood needs and design/environmental needs. These Guiding Principles are built on the issues, ideas and visions gleaned through the community outreach initiatives as well as the factual foundation established in the Capacity and Demand Analysis.

- **Development Action Areas:** This defines development timing and/or character, and infrastructure policies by geographic sub-areas of the Region. This is the growth management component of the Plan. Based on the provision of public services and proximity to existing urban areas, the timing of development is addressed. Likewise the “capacity” of the growth areas to accommodate projected 2030 population and economic growth is reviewed.

- **Future Land Use:** The Future Land Use component identifies and defines the specific land uses that are appropriate within the Region; also identified are recommendations on development densities by land use category. The Future Land Use is the Plan’s more “fine grained” aspect of the development picture; after examining the Region’s large undeveloped “macro” level, this component identifies the more site-specific “micro” level of appropriate land uses.

- **Regional Transportation Plan:** This addresses the future circulation system to accommodate growth and ensure the continuation of the street network. This portion of the Regional Plan is a 20-year transportation plan that will be updated in the future to reflect the Regional Development Plan’s 2030 planning horizon.

Regional Plan Guiding Principles

The Regional Plan’s “Guiding Principles” set the framework for the Plan by establishing the overarching goals and objectives for the Region’s future development, redevelopment or preservation. This is what “drives” the production of the Plan and its ultimate implementation over the long term.
Guiding Principles

The Guiding Principles are divided into five categories: 1) Regional Development, 2) Urban Development, 3) Rural Development, 4) Neighborhoods and, 5) Design Character and Environmental Quality. These Guiding Principles shape the physical layout of the Plan and the implementation strategies for future growth and development, as well as preservation and rehabilitation of existing urban and rural areas within the Region.

Regional Development Principles

- Encourage efficient and prudent extensions of infrastructure in a manner that considers impacts to both service providers and taxpayers.
- Develop seamless development regulations that consider geographic locations, physical and infrastructure constraints, and desired densities, regardless of jurisdictional boundaries.
  - The type and intensity of development should conform to the recommendations of the Development Plan and should not be hindered by jurisdictional boundaries.
- Identify lands appropriate to accommodate future service and industrial growth.

Urban Development Principles

- Provide public services and infrastructure to areas of the Region that are environmentally and economically suitable for urban growth.
  - Identify environmental and economic factors that make land suitable.
  - Provide for zoning consistent with the guiding principles.
- Support a Regional land use plan that maintains a strong and healthy urban core.
  - Make developing in the urbanized area easier by providing design standards that are flexible and market driven.
- Clearly define the role of the Metro Districts within the Region.
- Provide a Regional land use plan that recognizes the relative importance of Pueblo’s Downtown to the Region.
- Encourage economic planning that is consistent with the Regional Plan.
- Create a Regional land use plan that reduces the impact of development on the Region’s transportation system.
  - Adequately address arterial roadway system improvements in advance of development.
- Create a Regional Plan that supports viable alternatives to the automobile.
• Provide bus service to major employment centers.
• Provide for mixed use and in-fill development that make it convenient for employees to walk or bike to work.
• Improve and extend access to the bike paths.
• Provide a balance between developing new commercial and industrial sites and maintaining the viability of existing development.

**Rural Development Principles**

• Achieve a balance between urban and agricultural interests.
  • Make protecting property rights a top priority.
  • Preserve agricultural land by promoting development in areas adjacent to the urbanized area.
  • Discourage “leap-frog” development on prime agricultural land.
  • Preserve land through purchase or donation of development rights, including landowner education of the estate planning benefits of such conservation actions.
  • Protect water resources necessary for agricultural uses.
• Preserve character of the Region’s rural areas and communities.
  • Promote “right-to-farm” laws.
  • Promote the benefits of the local agriculture industry.
  • Encourage subdivisions in rural areas to develop as “cluster developments” with smaller lots surrounded by large areas of common open space.

**Design Character & Environmental Quality Principles**

• Plan growth to enhance the Region’s natural and historic character.
  • Determine methods to enhance and preserve the natural and historic features (e.g., preservation via conservation easements).
• Encourage development that adds to the aesthetic quality of the Region.
  • Create an “aesthetic vision” that reflects the residents desires.
  • Encourage development in existing areas where existing infrastructure is provided.
• Encourage the integration of open space into the Region’s land use plan.
  • Define open space by habitat, agriculture, parks, buffers & wildlife corridors.
Neighborhood Principle –
Promote new subdivision developments that are reflective of Pueblo’s older, traditional neighborhoods (mix of housing types and sizes, interconnected streets, neighborhood commercial and office, pedestrian friendly, accessible to parks, an abundance of street trees, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide a Regional Plan that recognizes the importance of the natural environment to the Region’s future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify those lands deemed valuable to be maintained as part of the natural environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighborhood Principles**

- Promote both historic & economic neighborhood revitalization & preservation.
- Promote new subdivision developments that are reflective of Pueblo’s older, traditional neighborhoods (mix of housing types and sizes, interconnected streets, neighborhood commercial and office, pedestrian friendly, accessible to parks, an abundance of street trees, etc.).
- Address open space and wildlife corridors in new neighborhood development.
- Update ordinances & building codes to provide more design flexibility.
Development Action Areas

The Growth Management Component

The Pueblo Region has a vast amount of land area – 2,400 square miles or 1.5 million acres. Of this, 1,915 square miles, or 1.2 million acres, is considered developable (unconstrained by existing development or environmental factors). Developable land includes land that is in active agricultural/ranching use. This land is not necessarily available for development, but because there are currently few limitations on agricultural/ranching lands being converted to “developed” acres, they were included in the developable or growth capacity acres.

Given the Region’s size, it is very important to have a Plan to identify the timing for when areas should develop and to articulate the required infrastructure policies. Without a Plan, the demand on City, County, Metro Districts, State and Federal agencies, utility boards and community service organizations to provide services to remote, poorly served, and/or scattered developments can be extremely costly. Without a Plan, ill-sited and ill-suited development greatly impacts the natural environment or the established agricultural/rural settlement patterns. Full use of the Regional Development Plan will provide the Pueblo Region with greater development “predictability” as well as efficiency in service delivery. This is particularly critical when considering the on-going trend of people choosing to live outside of the City in the unincorporated areas.

Description of Development Action Areas

The Regional Development Plan identifies “Development Action Areas,” which are geographically delineated development areas identified for future growth. Table 9 lists the six Development Action Areas and the Development Action Area Map shows the geographical locations of these areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9 – Development Action Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Urban Area – City of Pueblo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Urban Area – Urban Fringe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Metro District – Pueblo West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Metro District – Colorado City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Growth Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-Term Growth Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These areas range from “Developed Urban Area” to “Long-Term Growth Area.” The former category implies “ready for development – all infrastructure in place” with the latter implying “highly premature for development – no infrastructure in place.” Within the City limits of Pueblo (Developed Urban Area) and the City’s immediate periphery (Developing Urban Area), much of the infrastructure is in place or the cost for the extension of services is more efficient for local government and utility boards to serve. Portions of the Pueblo West and Colorado City Metro District are categorized as “Developing Metro District,” which implies short-term suitability for urban development, although limited utility services, particularly in Colorado City, will most likely affect development timing.

Timing of Development

A key component of the six “Development Action Areas” is the issue of “timing” of development. Table 10 summarizes the projected “timing” of the respective Action Areas. Timing or scheduling when these areas will most likely be developed is based on their proximity to existing development and the ease of providing public utilities, primarily sanitary sewer. Thus, identifying the timing of when development will most likely occur makes it possible to plan more systematically for expansion of public services.

Table 10 – Timing of Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Action Areas</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Urban Area</td>
<td>On-going infill &amp; redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Urban Areas</td>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Metro Area – Pueblo West</td>
<td>1 – 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Metro Area – Colorado City</td>
<td>1 – 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Term Urban Development</td>
<td>5 – 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Urban Development</td>
<td>&gt; 15 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Burnham Group, 2000

Developed Urban Area – City of Pueblo

Existing Character

The *Developed Urban Area* encompasses the City of Pueblo’s existing city limits and developed urban areas in close proximity to the City. Much of this area is fully developed with water, sewer and roads. This Area covers about three-fourths of the existing development within the Region. The *Developed Urban Area* can generally be broken down into four “Plan-
“Northeast Planning Quadrant: Belmont, Eastwood and University


Southeast Planning Quadrant: Eastside and Lower Eastside

Southwest Planning Quadrant: Aberdeen, Bessemer, Beulah Heights, El Camino, Highland Park, Lake Minnequa, Mesa Junction, Regency, South Gate, SouthPointe, State Fair, Sunny Heights, and Sunset Park

Future Character

The future character of the Developed Urban Area will be major mixed use development (residential, office and commercial), as well as cultural/governmental facilities within the downtown area. Medium to high density residential, as well as detached and attached single-family residential will continue to be the dominant land use feature throughout the area. The Area will also experience compatible infill and redevelopment with density and intensity of development remaining consistent with established patterns of development. The Developed Urban Area will also continue to serve as the major retail, office and service center for the Region.

The City of Pueblo’s Quadrant Planning, as well as its neighborhood planning, will assist greatly in more specifically defining the development, infill and redevelopment character within the Developed Urban Area.

Developing Urban Area

Existing Character

The Developing Urban Area, which lies on the periphery of the Developed Urban Area, includes areas in which development activity is beginning to occur or is imminent. In general, this is an area in which major infrastructure already exists, for the most part, and in which there is substantial building already taking place. There remains, however, additional infrastructure investment to be put in place before full development can be realized. The Developing Urban Area includes University Park, Northridge, SouthPointe and Southwest Pueblo.

Future Character – University Park

The University Park Developing Urban Area will continue to be dominated by suburban residential development with major regional commercial service area along Dillon Drive, between Fountain Creek and I-25. High density residential is considered appropriate as a transitional land use between the commercial and lower density suburban development. Future development should create cohesive commercial nodes with improved pedestrian linkages and vehicular circulation, including extension of 48th Street into University Park. Neighborhood commercial service uses should be en-
couraged in village setting near the University. Substantial efforts should be made to protect the 100-year floodplain of Fountain Creek.

**Future Character – Northridge**

The Northridge Developing Urban Area will continue to develop as urban residential with high density residential as a transitional land use between the commercial and urban residential development. The Medical Center and the arterial commercial with its emphasis on the hospitality industry will continue to flourish along I-25 and Highway 50.

Future efforts should enhance the arterial corridors as gateways into Pueblo with access management on Highway 50 a major component of the plan. Lighting impacts associated with commercial development should also be addressed, as well as protection of future right-of-ways for Pueblo Boulevard. Cohesive development should be encouraged on land at U.S. 50 and Pueblo Boulevard.

**Future Character – SouthPointe**

The SouthPointe Developing Urban Area is an 1,800 acre planned development with a 20–30 year build out horizon. Its northeastern boundary is located at the intersection of Pueblo Boulevard and I-25, running west to Lariat Road (Old Burnt Mill Road) and south about 1½ miles from the City of Pueblo’s current city limits. The northeastern section of SouthPointe will be developed as commercial, business park and high density residential. The central/south section of the development will be commercial, business park, high density residential and institutional uses. The third and western section will be developed as eight urban villages with low to medium intensity development.

**Future Character – Southwest Pueblo**

The Southwest Pueblo Developing Urban Area will continue to develop in its urban residential pattern served by Highway 78 and the pattern of collector streets. Upgrading and extension of Bandera Boulevard northwest, connecting to Stonemoor Hills and Red Creek Springs Ranch Road, will have a major impact on this area. Additional commercial development will be limited to northeast of the existing cemetery (Highway 78). As development occurs, there will be a need to expand the collector road network.

**Developing Metro Area - Pueblo West (core area)**

**Existing Character**

The Pueblo West Developing Metro’s Core Area is the central part of this Metro District’s 31,000 acres (land area slightly larger than City of Pueblo). This area is the portion of the District that is platted for suburban residential development (43% of the 18,700 platted residential lots) and comprises 21% of the District’s total acreage. In 2000, this was the area where most of the District’s estimated 18,000 residents resided. It also in-
includes the arterial commercial and light industrial uses oriented near Highway 50.

**Future Character**

The future character of the *Pueblo West Developing Metro Core Area* is a continuation of existing suburban development patterns on that area served or planned to be served by sanitary sewer. Arterial commercial and light industrial mixed-use development will continue as planned in designated areas along Highway 50. As development continues, the trail system will continue to be developed. It is recommended that a reevaluation of the land ownership patterns be examined to determine if a more systematic development pattern can be attained.

**Developing Metro District - Colorado City (core area)**

**Existing Character**

The *Colorado City Developing Metro Core Area* encompasses much of the District’s 8,500 acres and includes the 3,000 lots with water and sewer (80% of the 16,800 residential lots are ¼ acre lots). In 2000, this was the area where much of the District’s estimated population of 1,900 people resided. This District’s population growth has been much slower than that experienced by Pueblo West, due to its more remote location from major population centers such as the City of Pueblo and Colorado Springs.

**Future Character**

The future character of the *Colorado City Developing Metro Core Area* is a continuation of existing residential development patterns in a more suburban-type setting with limited commercial services developed as village-type commercial centers. The area will serve as a southern gateway to Pueblo County and expand its hospitality businesses in proximity to the I-25 interchange.

**Mid-Term Growth Areas**

**Existing Character**

The *Mid-Term Growth Areas* are predominantly undeveloped areas located outside the existing developing urban area. These areas are developable with extension of existing infrastructure, but will generally require major capital investments, such as extensions of existing arterial roads, interceptor sewer lines and major water distribution lines if development occurs prematurely. This area includes Platteville/Eden/University, Baxter/Airport, SouthPointe and Southwest Pueblo.
Future Character – Platteville/Eden/University

The *Platteville-Eden-University Mid-Term Growth Area* wraps around the northern tier of the urban area just north of the University of Southern Colorado and the existing Northridge area. There will be continuation of arterial commercial along I-25, primarily along the west side of the interstate with a small amount on the eastside. Further commercial development on the east side will be constrained by the Fountain Creek Flood Plain. West of the commercial development will be urban residential development. The western boundary of this *Mid-Term Growth Area* will be the extension of Pueblo Boulevard for which protection of future right-of-ways will be a priority. Cohesive development should be encouraged along Pueblo Boulevard extension with access control standards made a part of the development process. To the east of Fountain Creek will be a continuation of suburban residential with neighborhood commercial appropriately sited and designed.

Future Character – Baxter/Airport Area

The *Baxter-Airport Mid-Term Growth Area* stretches eastward from the City of Pueblo to the Pueblo Airport Industrial Park. Its southern boundary is the Arkansas River and its northern boundary generally Highways 96 and 50 Bypass. Arterial commercial and light industrial nodes will be developed along U.S. 50 with primary access from existing north-south roads. Suburban residential will continue north of the Arkansas River to about 200 feet south of U.S. 50.

Future Character – SouthPointe

SouthPointe is fully addressed in the “Developing Urban Area – SouthPointe” narrative.

Future Character – Southwest Pueblo

The *Southwest Pueblo Mid-Term Growth Area*, located generally between and on either side of Highways 78 and 96, will see a continuation of the urban residential patterns seen in the “Developing Urban Area,” with appropriate neighborhood commercial services. Areas closer to the Arkansas River will be more appropriately developed as suburban residential. Much of the future development depends entirely on extension of major north-south access, upgrading of Red Creek Springs Road and improvement of general connectivity to neighborhoods to the east.

Long-Term Growth Area

General Character

There are two *Long-Term Growth Areas*, one located northeast of Pueblo around the Baculite Mesa and the other located wrapping around southwest of Pueblo from the Arkansas River to I-25, including portions of SouthPointe. These areas are within the planned sewer and water service...
Future Character – Northeast Pueblo-Baculite Mesa

The Northeast Pueblo-Baculite Mesa Long-Term Growth Area will continue the suburban residential development pattern seen in the University area. Care should be taken to discourage very low-density 40-acre “hobby farms” from developing with limited amounts of public services or improvements. This type of rural development pattern will often preempt an area from suburban development opportunities. As this area develops, future street right-of-ways should be preserved.

Future Character – SouthPointe

SouthPointe is fully addressed in the “Developing Urban Area – SouthPointe” narrative.

Future Character – Southwest Pueblo

The Southwest Pueblo Long-Term Growth Area will continue the urban residential development pattern seen in the Southwest Mid-Term Growth Area. As in the Pueblo Northeast-Baculite Mesa Long-Term Area, care should be taken to discourage very low-density 40-acre “hobby farms” from developing with limited amounts of public services or improvements. This type of rural development pattern will often preempt an area from suburban or urban development opportunities. As this area develops, future street right-of-ways should be preserved.

Future Development Capacity

The Development Action Areas’ capacity to accommodate future development is a key test for determining the adequacy of the delineated Action Area boundaries. Population and employment projections through 2030, indicate that the Pueblo Region will grow by 60,000 people and add 73,000 jobs. This growth will create a demand for 30,000 dwelling units that will consume a projected 21,000 acres. Likewise, the projected job growth will consume a projected 9,000 acres for new commercial, office, industrial, and institutional uses. [See Table 5]

Table 11, Capacity of Development Action Areas, indicates that the Development Action Areas have sufficient capacity to accommodate projected growth in residential development (36,780 dwelling units or 123% of the demand). Regarding capacity to accommodate new commercial, office, industrial, and institutional uses, the Development Action Areas can accommodate 65% of the non-residential demand. These capacities are based on how the land is currently zoned and much of the land area identified as suitable for urban development is currently zoned “agriculture.” Appropriate rezoning in the future can increase capacities.
### Table 11 – Capacity of Development Action Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Areas</th>
<th>Residential Capacity (Dwellings)</th>
<th>Employment Capacity (Jobs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Urban Area</td>
<td>3,590</td>
<td>12,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Urban Areas</td>
<td>8,375</td>
<td>15,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Metro District – Pueblo West</td>
<td>6,180</td>
<td>10,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Metro District – Colorado City</td>
<td>11,200</td>
<td>3,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid Term Urban Development</td>
<td>6,185</td>
<td>5,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Urban Development</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36,780</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,490</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The dwelling and employment capacity figures that are within Action Areas located in the City of Pueblo are very conservative given the fact that “capacity” is based on the existing zoning. Much of the land area within the “Developing,” “Mid Term,” and “Long Term” Action Areas is currently zoned low density A-1 Agriculture. Specifically, there are two urban-level developments within the City of Pueblo, Eagleridge and SouthPointe, that have been master planned but have not been rezoned from A-1 to higher urban densities. If developed as planned, they would increase the City of Pueblo’s dwelling unit capacity by over 7,000 units and provide a number of employment opportunities.

Source: The Burnham Group; Fregonese/Calthorp. 2000
Future Land Use

Planning for Future Land Uses is a shift from the “macro” level of regional planning and managing growth, to the more “fine grain” site-specific future land uses. The Future Land Use map at the end of the Plan should be used as a guide for making decisions concerning the appropriateness of planned development with respect to land use.

Defining Future Regional Land Uses

The Region’s Future Land Uses span a large spectrum of development categories, from “Country Village” in Beulah to “Urban Mixed Use” in the City of Pueblo. Table 12 lists the Future Land Use categories identified in the Regional Plan maps and discussed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural/Ranch</th>
<th>Urban Mixed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Production Agriculture</td>
<td>Arterial Commercial Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Parks, Open Space &amp; River Corridors</td>
<td>Employment Center – Office Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Village</td>
<td>Employment Center – Light Industry Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Residential</td>
<td>Employment Center – Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Residential</td>
<td>Institutional Mixed Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>Special Development Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rural/Ranch

A significant portion of the 1,900 square miles of developable land in the Pueblo Region is projected to remain in the category of Rural/Ranch. This is sparsely populated acreage devoted to traditional ranching operations, large rural land holdings and “ranchettes” (developed under Senate Bill 35, a 35-acre exemption from subdivision requirements). Often carved from large former ranch holdings, "ranchettes" have significant impact on the rural landscape. Without public water or paved streets, this increasingly prevalent residential land use is having a significant impact on the demand for public services for remote, very low-density areas of the Region. Residential uses should only be permitted on large acreage tracts or in cluster developments that maintain an overall low density, while preserving substantial amounts of contiguous open space. Where possible, developers should incorporate environmentally sensitive areas, including the floodplain, into the development to preserve and protect the natural environment. Zoning in these areas should limit density to 2 units per 35-acres (al-
lowing for the sharing of a single well) but encourage clustering to preserve open spaces. The only commercial zoning in these areas should be to allow such agricultural support activities as livestock auctions, feed and grain sales, fertilizer and chemical sales and farm equipment sales and repair; neighborhood commercial services may be appropriate at major intersections along state highways or arterial-level county roads.

**Production Agriculture**

The *Production Agriculture* category pertains to prime agricultural land located east of the St. Charles River and within the bottomlands adjacent to Fountain Creek, north of Pueblo. These prime agricultural areas are known to possess rich, fertile soils, and the Soil Conservation Service has classified the soils as being prime for agricultural use. There remain a number of viable farm operations within these areas despite increasing pressures from suburban development. The protection and preservation of the prime agricultural lands is the primary purpose of this land use designation. Some on-site sales of products are appropriate including small farm markets, and similar uses. Any of these associated commercial activities should be limited in size to prevent the proliferation of commercial development in rural setting.

Not all lands within these areas may be prime or suitable for agricultural. Limited residential development should be permitted, particularly when such development may contribute to the protection of prime agricultural lands. However, in an effort to conserve agricultural resources and to decrease the necessity of selling farmland due to high land values, minimal public infrastructure should be made available, especially public sewer services. Residential uses should only be permitted on large lots or in cluster developments that maintain overall low density.

Residential development in these areas should follow a planned development process that includes requirements to minimize adverse impacts on production agriculture. Planning techniques such as undisturbed native plant buffers between farm fields and private yards and separate road systems for farm and residential uses should be used to minimize the negative impacts of residential development on continuing agricultural activities. The only commercial zoning in these areas should be to allow such agricultural support activities as livestock auctions, feed and grain sales, fertilizer and chemical sales and farm equipment sales and repair; neighborhood commercial services may be appropriate at major intersections along state highways or arterial-level county roads.

**Large Parks, Open Space, Greenways & River Corridors**

*Large Parks, Open Space, Greenways & River Corridors* are primarily passive recreational uses such as the Pueblo Reservoir, San Isabel National Forest, south end of the Fort Carson Military Reservation, Bureau of Reclamation and State of Colorado lands, Mineral Palace, City Park, the Honor Farm, existing and planned greenways, and water courses such as the Arkansas River and Fountain Creek.
Presently the Fountain Creek greenway system includes 300 acres extending from the confluence with the Arkansas River north to the city boundary. The Arkansas River greenway system includes 260 acres extending from the confluence with Fountain Creek to Lake Pueblo State Park. The concept of a major river greenway system in the floodplains of the Fountain Creek and Arkansas River has been an integral goal of the Pueblo Region since the 1960’s. The goals and objectives include:

- Controlling or limiting of flood damage by coordinating flood control plans with the natural amenities of the greenway system.
- Retaining and restoring the existing natural amenities of the rivers.
- Developing a trail system that utilizes the drainage pattern of tributaries and transportation networks to connect trails, as well as major recreation areas.
- Using the floodplain in conjunction with other undeveloped lands that make up the greenway to define and shape the urban form of Pueblo.
- Satisfying the physical open space needs of the residents.
- Expanding the greenway system as the City of Pueblo’s boundaries increase, including the addition of greenways along the Wild Horse Creek and the Goodnight Arroyo tributaries.

Plans will be to maintain, expand, and connect these areas through a series of linear parks, sidewalks and signage to create a regional wide system of parks, recreation and greenways. As developers plan and design new developments, both residential and non-residential, they should be encouraged to work to preserve and incorporate the natural environment. Flood plains should be preserved for park lands and greenways for recreational and conservation use.

Where properties with this designation remain in private hands, they should be subject to zoning designations that, where possible, require clustering of development. This would move development densities out of the flood-sensitive area and preserve these lands as common open space or include them in land required to be dedicated for public passive recreational use.

**Country Village**

Through the Pueblo Region’s “recent” 150 year old history, there have been a number of small-town and community-scale settlement areas that have been a part of that history. The Regional Plan categorizes areas like Beulah, Rye, Avondale and Boone as *Country Villages*. These areas are situated in more remote areas of the Region, providing both neighborhood housing developments and commercial retail support services to serve the day-to-day needs of residents.

*Country Villages* are encouraged to have commercial services of the scale and character that reflect past development. Likewise, the street network of future residential development should maintain the traditional grid

---

**Large Parks, Open Space, Greenways & River Corridors** - the Reservoir, San Isabel National Forest, other federal and state land holdings, Mineral Palace, City Park, the Honor Farm, greenways, and the Arkansas River and Fountain Creek.

Flood plains should be preserved for park lands and greenways for recreational and conservation use ... properties with this designation should be subject to zoning designations that require clustering of development.

**Country Villages** · areas like Beulah, Rye, Avondale and Boone ... commercial services that reflect past development trends and street network that maintains traditional grid pattern.
pattern typical of the area’s history. As community potable water and sewer systems are expanded, some higher density development may be appropriate. Zoning should maintain 1-acre and larger lots in areas without public sewer and allow densities up to 3 or 4 units per acre where both public sewer and water are available. Neighborhood commercial zoning will be appropriate at appropriate intersections of collector roads or collector and arterial roads. Each country village should have one or two areas with community commercial zoning. Many Country Villages are adjacent to agricultural and forest lands. When considering the extension of services, consideration should be given to ensure adjacent agricultural, forest, or other resources aren’t harmed or placed in jeopardy.

**Country Residential**

*Country Residential* provides large lot development options typically ranging from 1–5 acres in size. This land use is intended to remain more rural in character without public sewer service, but having some suburban amenities such as public water service designed with sufficient capacity for fire protection services. These *Country Residential* uses are recommended for the one-to-five acre lot development found in northern and southwestern portions of Pueblo West, St. Charles Mesa immediately east of the City of Pueblo, Baxter/Airport area (residential area) and areas surrounding the edges of Colorado City and the Town of Rye.

Due to poor drainage in some areas such as the Mesa, lot development should be maintained as low density. Lot clustering that maintains an overall low density, while preserving substantial contiguous open space is encouraged in these areas. *Country Residential* will be planned to include greenways or preserve agricultural land. Where possible, developers should incorporate environmentally sensitive areas, including the floodplain, into the development to create unique neighborhoods while protecting the natural environment. Zoning should reinforce the low-density designations for these areas. The only commercial uses in these areas should be small, neighborhood-level convenience centers, located at intersections of collector roads or of a collector and an arterial road.

Country Residential may also exist in the City where full public services and infrastructure may or may not be available. These areas would be country in character and may or may not incorporate urban features such as curb, gutter and sidewalks. *Editor Note: Discussions are ongoing concerning the development of sanitary sewer for portions of the St. Charles Mesa. If this occurs, the Regional Development Plan should be amended to change the portion of the Mesa planned for sewer to “Suburban Residential.”*

**Suburban Residential**

The *Suburban Residential* land use designation identifies residential subdivisions with densities from 1 to 3 units an acre spread along curvilinear and cul-de-sac streets. While these communities may include various size and price ranges of homes, the primary land use is single-family de-
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tached homes. Included in this zone is a mix of uses that are complimentary to residential areas such as schools, parks, libraries, golf courses and neighborhood commercial services.

Areas identified as Suburban Residential are developments within the City of Pueblo, including the neighborhoods of Belmont, Country Club, portions of Sunny Heights and El Camino, the area around the University of Southern Colorado, as well as within Pueblo West (eastern area of smaller lots on sanitary sewer).

Suburban Residential will be served by water and sewer services. New Suburban Residential will be planned to include neighborhood parks and greenspaces that provide links with the Region’s parks and recreation. The number of cul-de-sacs will be minimized, emphasizing multiple connections through and between subdivisions.

Most zoning in suburban residential areas will be for single-family residential uses at densities of 1 to 3 units per acre. Zoning for duplexes, garden apartments and small office buildings may be allowed along arterial roads passing through these areas, although access to such properties should generally be from separate collector roads. Neighborhood commercial zoning will be appropriate at some intersections of two collector roads or of a collector and an arterial road. Although convenience stores with gasoline and full services may be appropriate at some locations along arterial roads, some neighborhood business areas should exclude gasoline sales, alcohol sales and drive-through window services of all types. Zoning for institutional uses, such as religious institutions, schools, group-homes and day-care centers will be found in these areas, but these institutional uses may be subject to additional standards, requiring location along collector or arterial roads, buffers from single-family homes, landscaping of parking areas, spacing requirements and/or other standards developed as part of a zoning ordinance update.

Urban Residential

The Urban Residential neighborhoods are found predominantly within the city limits of Pueblo and the urbanizing areas in the City’s immediate periphery. These neighborhoods have a mixture of housing types and neighborhood commercial services. They are generally located on a grid roadway network that interconnects a large portion of the urban area. The existing mixture of housing types that range from single-family detached housing to duplexes and multi-family housing will be continued with emphasis on maintaining the existing housing stock and in-fill development. Where appropriate, neighborhood scale commercial services will be created to provide the necessary day-to-day needs of residents within walking distance.

Development in these Urban Neighborhoods is typically at densities of 4 to 7 units per acre and often reflects the traditional urban residential layout used in the early development of Pueblo. Their tree-lined streets, front porches and square blocks frequently identify urban neighborhoods.

Suburban Residential – served by water and sewer services at densities of 1 to 3 units per acre … Belmont, Country Club, portions of Sunny Heights and El Camino, area around USC, and core area of Pueblo West.

Urban Residential – predominantly within the city limits of Pueblo and its urbanizing periphery … with densities from 4 to 7 units per acre … often reflect the traditional urban residential layout used in the early development of Pueblo.
This type of development is also seeing a comeback in newer subdivisions. As infill development begins to occur, this urban form will be continued. This will help maintain the unique character of these neighborhoods. Emphasis should be placed on maintaining the existing neighborhood parks and investing in the existing housing stock, and developing compatibility standards for new in-fill construction.

_Urban Residential_ neighborhoods are typically found within the City of Pueblo such as Mesa Junction, Eastside, Bessemer, Northside, Aberdeen, State Park, and Hyde Park. As the City of Pueblo expands to the north, south (SouthPointe) and southwest, a continuation of these _Urban Residential Areas_ should be continued. Interconnected neighborhoods, sanitary sewer and neighborhood parks should be an integral part of the development.

Zoning in urban residential areas will include a variety of zones for residential, institutional, office, service and commercial uses. Zoning in many areas should remain focused on single-family homes, with minimum lot sizes consistent with existing patterns of development. Zoning for duplexes, garden apartments and small office buildings may be allowed along collector and arterial roads, including some once-local roads that currently carry traffic loads making them function as collectors or arterials. Community-scale commercial zoning will be appropriate at some intersections of two collector roads or of a collector and an arterial road. Although convenience stores with gasoline and full services may be appropriate at some locations along arterial roads, some neighborhood business areas should exclude gasoline sales, alcohol sales and drive-through window services of all types. Zoning for institutional uses, such as religious institutions, schools, group-homes and day-care centers will be found in these areas, but these institutional uses may be subject to additional standards, requiring location along collector or arterial roads, buffers from single-family homes, landscaping of parking areas, spacing requirements and/or other standards developed as part of a zoning ordinance update. Zoning for live-work spaces, allowing a broader range of “home occupations” than in other areas, should be considered along some collector and arterial streets. Residential uses should be allowed above and behind retail and office uses throughout these areas.

**High Density Residential**

There are several areas within the City of Pueblo where _High Density Residential_ land use is located. These multiple family housing complexes, having densities of 8 to 12 units an acre, are primarily found within the Minnequa, Belmont and Northridge areas of the City of Pueblo and within Pueblo West along Highway 50. This land use includes townhomes, row houses and apartment buildings. Zoning for these areas should encourage multiple family housing complexes, with appropriate buffers and setbacks to maintain reasonable compatibility with lower density development nearby. It is anticipated that _High Density Residential_ be well integrated into the neighborhood fabric in scale, street network and neighborhood parks. Zoning for adjoining lands may include zoning for community-level retail activities and for offices.
Urban Mixed Use

Urban Mixed Use is identified as a land use appropriate for the City of Pueblo within the traditional Downtown area. It is supported by the presence of the HARP (Historic Arkansas Riverwalk of Pueblo), the retail corridor of Union Avenue and the Depot, as well as other existing retail and office development found throughout the Downtown. Urban Mixed Use consists of a mixture of office, retail, higher-density residential and public uses that tend to spur redevelopment of underutilized commercial and office buildings as well as former downtown industrial sites. The Urban Mixed Use is found along Union Avenue and the HARP and northward toward the Pueblo County Courthouse and southward to include Mesa Junction. The Lakeside Drive area south of the Downtown and parts of Northern Avenue, also have been identified as Urban Mixed Use.

Within the Urban Mixed Use, retail uses are emphasized on the first floor of all buildings to maintain a high activity level; at least along selected corridors, zoning should require retail or other active uses on the first floor along pedestrian routes. Office and residential apartments are encouraged on the upper floors in multi-story buildings. Some higher-density, freestanding residential may also exist in this land use category. In addition, all efforts will be made to maintain the unique character of buildings throughout the area and any new development will be built in a style compatible with the surrounding area. The grid pattern street network and building setbacks created by existing buildings will be maintained. Floor area ratios, the relationship of building square footage to the size of the lot, of non-residential development will be encouraged to maintain a ratio of 1.5. Residential densities will be encouraged to reach higher densities than found in typical suburban settings; densities encouraged will reach upwards of 16 units per acre. These suggested densities encourage pedestrian-oriented development patterns reflective of more historic development within the urban area of the Region. Zoning in these areas should provide for a full range of commercial, office and selected service uses. Knowledge-based industries should be encouraged in these areas, but assembly and warehousing areas should be discouraged because of their generally anti-pedestrian character.

Arterial Commercial Mixed Use

Arterial Commercial Mixed Use includes the large commercial areas and corridors found along key sections of I-25, portions of Highway 50, Pueblo Boulevard, Highway 47, Santa Fe Drive, Prairie Avenue and Northern Avenue. While the primary focus of these areas is retail sales and personal services, some office space is intermixed. This land use category does not prohibit any compatible land use other than heavy industrial uses. Arterial Commercial Mixed Use, located along major routes such as I-25 and Highway 50, is designed more for the regional retail market segment, while Arterial Commercial Mixed Use along other transportation arteries is more geared to community-level shopping and services. Zoning in these areas should provide for hotels, motels, large restaurants and other hospitality...
uses, as well as highway-oriented auto and truck services and both community- and regional-scale commercial activities.

The geographic boundaries of Arterial Commercial Mixed Use should be controlled to limit uncontrolled “strip” expansion of commercial development along arterial roadways, and instead concentrate on developing activity nodes. The scale of the commercial development will be reflective of the service market area (regional versus community). Developers will be encouraged to develop creative Arterial Commercial Mixed Use that does not place focal emphasis on the parking areas but on the commercial uses themselves. This can be accomplished by placing some parking to the side or behind buildings and utilizing internal landscaping throughout the parking areas. Signage and lighting should be placed to ensure visibility without being excessive.

**Employment Center – Office Park**

Employment Center is a future land use category that is planned with potential for the location of major economic-base employers, such as the North and South Pueblo Gateways, D.O.T Test Track, Former Army Depot, Airport Industrial Park, and Pueblo West Industrial Park. These may be developed as mixed-use office parks, manufacturers and regional distribution and service centers. Some of these lands are more fully developed than others, but realization of the full potential of these sites will depend, in most cases, on significant additional investment in infrastructure; an exception to this is the Airport Industrial Park. Zoning in employment centers should allow office uses, warehousing, assembly and light manufacturing uses. Supporting commercial uses, including restaurants, convenience stores and service stations, should be allowed within the designated areas but typically not along the major arterials providing access to the areas; allowing development of a strip of auto-oriented uses at the entrance to such an area may create practical, economic and visual barriers to economic development within the area.

Office Park is a future land use category that is planned for two distinct gateway areas into the City of Pueblo, the northern gateway (Porter Draw/Eden Interchanges on I-25) and the southern gateway (near SouthPointe along I-25). It is envisioned that these two areas of Office Park land use will be developed in a “corporate campus” style with substantial landscaping and open space to create an attractive image. Activities in these areas may include some light assembly and light warehousing, but where such uses exist, there should be separate circulation systems for trucks and autos. Supporting commercial uses should be allowed on the same terms as in the “Employment Centers,” discussed immediately above.

**Employment Center – Light Industry Mixed Use**

Light Industry Mixed Use, such as manufacturing, assembling, research and development, provide tax revenues and jobs for the Region. These uses will be continued and expanded upon in a planned manner so as to minimize the impact on the public infrastructure. Light Industry Mixed
Use areas include the Airport Industrial Park and its environs, Pueblo West Industrial Park, an area east of Runyon Park near the Arkansas River and in the south of Pueblo along I-25.

Light Industry Mixed Use will be located within planned industrial parks and will offer some commercial and office services. This use will not include industrial processes that emit significant smoke, noise or odors, or handle hazardous materials. Wherever possible, this use will be located away from residential uses. When potential conflicts between land uses occur, buffering and landscaping will be provided to minimize the impacts. Like residential growth, new industrial growth should be located in areas to best preserve surrounding agricultural uses and the natural environment.

Employment Center – Industry

Areas reserved for Employment Center – Industry are strategically located near rail and highways. The designated sites also take advantage of existing brownfields (older industrial sites) such as the steel mill. This land use classification is also used to describe wastewater treatment facilities. Zoning should limit foundries, refineries, petroleum storage, large assembly, and asphalt and concrete plants to areas designated by the zoning district map; many new heavy industrial uses may be made subject to special permit or other review processes rather than permitted by right.

Institutional Mixed Use

Institutional Mixed Use is a category that includes public and semi-public uses such as hospitals, governmental complexes, the State Fair Grounds, the University of Southern Colorado and Pueblo Community College, high schools, cemeteries, etc. Also included in this designation are support uses for such activities as medical offices, lodging and restaurants. The intention of this category is to allow institutions room to expand while preventing unwanted encroachment into neighborhoods. It is encouraged that as new urban and suburban development occurs, that Institutional Mixed Use be incorporated into the overall development pattern. Site design that ensures site compatibility with adjacent development is critical with this category of land use.

Zoning to allow such institutional uses should generally be applied to an area only upon the request of an institutional landowner. In most cases, zoning to allow major institutional uses should be expanded into residential areas in full-block increments, limiting the situations where major institutions and residences will exist on the same block. Where institutional uses adjoin residential areas, parking and loading areas generally should be kept interior to the institutional use; where such activities occur on the periphery, they should be buffered by significant landscaping and, in appropriate cases, fences and walls.
Special Development Areas

Special Development Areas have been identified on the Future Land Use Map. These are areas where there appear to be multiple possibilities for development as well as significant care to be taken with the development. Most of these areas will be developed through Master Development Plans created either by the developer or in cases of publicly owned land, the City and the County.

Special Development Areas are undeveloped lands with significant development and/or open space potential in strategic locations that suggest the need for careful, location-specific plans for infrastructure and private development. Master plans should be prepared prior to development or re-development occurring.

Future Land Use Intensities

A key part of the character of Future Land Uses is the intensity (or density) at which development occurs. Table 13 provides a summary of recommended land use intensities. These intensities should be considered as a guide for future development, not as absolutes.

Table 13 – Future Land Use Intensities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Categories</th>
<th>Typical Density</th>
<th>Pueblo</th>
<th>Pueblo West</th>
<th>CO City</th>
<th>County/Towns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural/Ranch</td>
<td>1 unit/35 acres</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Agriculture</td>
<td>1 unit/35 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Parks/Open Space</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Residential</td>
<td>1 unit/acre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ Rye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Village</td>
<td>1 unit/acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Residential</td>
<td>1-3 units/acre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Residential</td>
<td>4-7 units/acre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>&gt;7 units/acre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Mixed Use (MXD)</td>
<td>16 units/acre</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Commercial MXD</td>
<td>.50 FAR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Park/Employment</td>
<td>.25 FAR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional MXD</td>
<td>.50 FAR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial MXD</td>
<td>.25 FAR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>.25 FAR</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Development Area</td>
<td>TBA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAR Floor Area Ratio (ratio of building area to lot size)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Land use can be found within this geographical area</td>
<td>Source: The Burnham Group, 2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Transportation Plan

Transportation planning influences, and is influenced by, many other forms of planning—especially those which affect potential and future land uses. Similarly, it must deal with the many uncertainties inherent in the forecasts, projections, and visions of the future that prevail at any single point in time. Because of these unknown and sometimes unknowable issues, transportation planning in the Pueblo area is designed as a continuous and ongoing process.

Regional Transportation Goals and Objectives

As part of the Pueblo Region’s transportation planning process, a set of Transportation Goals and Objectives were developed. Although these goals and objectives were developed for transportation planning purposes, it is clear that they are highly supportive of the overall vision contained in the Regional Development Plan’s Guiding Principles. The Transportation Goals enumerated below address “Mobility, Land Use and Livability,” key components of the Guiding Principles.

Mobility Goal

Plan, develop and maintain a safe and efficient multi-modal transportation system to preserve and enhance the present and future mobility needs of the Pueblo Region.

Objectives

1. Maintain, protect and improve the safety for the multi-modal transportation system users;
2. Ensure interconnectivity between major activity centers by developing and promoting mode transfer points (e.g., park-and-ride facilities, bike-on-bus, etc.) to enhance the use of alternative modes within the inter-modal transportation system; and
3. Minimize traffic congestion by efficiently using the existing multi-modal transportation system by emphasizing transportation system management and operations techniques and travel demand management strategies to improve the passenger carrying capacity of the network.

Land Use Goal

Coordinate the interaction of transportation systems and land use planning to promote orderly expansion of the multi-modal transportation system serving the Pueblo Region.

Objectives

1. Plan, build, and manage the capacity of the multi-modal transportation system to be consistent with approved land use and master plans.
2. Develop a rational relationship between transportation facilities and adjacent land uses through comprehensive planning, design, implementation and appropriate maintenance;

3. Require advance right-of-way reservation, corridor preservation, and dedication for transportation facilities through local government land development process and other means;

4. Provide regional multi-modal access for major activity centers; and

5. Encourage development patterns that facilitate transit use and reduce the rate of growth in region-wide vehicle-miles traveled.

**Livability Goal**

Create, enhance and maintain a safe, healthful and aesthetically pleasing living environment by integrating transportation mobility needs with those of the citizens within the Pueblo Region.

**Objectives**

1. Minimize air, noise and other adverse transportation related impacts on residential areas;

2. Protect neighborhood integrity by minimizing the volume of traffic that is generated outside of a neighborhood from traveling through the neighborhood;

3. Preserve and enhance the aesthetics of the existing transportation corridors; and

4. Provide for the safe interaction between all modes of transportation and the citizens of the Pueblo Region.

**Regional Transportation Plan Elements**

During 1999, parallel to the development of the Regional Development Plan, PACOG engaged the services of TranSystems Corporation to prepare the *Pueblo Regional Transportation Plan - Year 2020* that identified major and minor transportation corridors and transportation modes for the next twenty years. The Transportation Plan addresses travel demand, streets and highways, public transit, bicycle and pedestrian mobility, aviation, and freight movement... it was adopted by PACOG in January 2000.

The Transportation Plan addresses travel demand, streets and highways, public transit, bicycle and pedestrian mobility, aviation, and freight movement... it was adopted by PACOG in January 2000.

**Eden Interchange Study**

addressed the alignment of the northerly extension of Pueblo Boulevard and a potential connection to Interstate 25 between Eagleridge Drive and Bragdon.

**Pueblo Boulevard Extension Study**

In 2000, the Eden Interchange Study was completed by the Colorado Department of Transportation. This study addressed the alignment of the northerly extension of Pueblo Boulevard and a potential connection to Interstate 25 between Eagleridge Drive and Bragdon. This study provides transportation connectivity between Pueblo West Metro District and I-25.
**Northeast Quadrant Transportation Study**

Kimley-Horn and Associates completed a major transportation study of Pueblo County’s northeast quadrant in year 2000. This study, the Northeast Quadrant Transportation Study, identified four potential east-west corridors that could provide access to the Pueblo Chemical Depot (which is now planning major chemical demilitarization activities) and seven north-south corridors between I-25 and the Depot. This overlay of transportation corridors form a basic transportation grid for the northeast quadrant.

**I-25 Corridor Study**

In 2000, a major study of the I-25 Corridor through the center of the City of Pueblo was begun by CH2M Hill. This was a cooperative venture with CDOT, the City of Pueblo, Pueblo County, and several ad-hoc Community Working Groups. This ongoing study, which is also developing a countywide transportation model, is using the same base data, projected land uses, and socio-economic forecasts, which were developed for the Regional Development Plan. This will assure that, to the maximum extent possible, that the assumptions about the future will be consistent and coordinated for all phases of the current planning process, including this major transportation facility.

**Roadway Corridor Preservation Plan (RCPP)**

In 2000, the Roadway Corridor (and right-of-way) Preservation Plan (RCPP) for the Pueblo Region was adopted by PACOG as a major component of the 2020 Regional Transportation Plan. The RCPP was a cooperative effort between local transportation officials and the Regional Development Plan consultant team who provided frequent updates with respect to proposed land uses and development criteria. In the next year, the RCPP is expected to be incorporated into ordinances and standards within the subdivision regulations in both the City and the County. It will also serve as the future network for the transportation model being developed for the I-25 project discussed above. Identified future roadway corridor right-of-ways that are desirable to be preserved are shown on the accompanying “Development Action Areas Map” and the “Future Land Use Plan Map.”

**Integrating Transportation into the Regional Plan**

As can be seen from the above discussion, there has been and continues to be a constant interaction between the various groups, firms, and agencies that are engaged in the development of various plans for the future of the Pueblo Region. Through this interactive process, the complex relationships among existing and proposed land uses and existing and proposed transportation facilities are constantly examined and modified where necessary until each of the components “best fits” with all of the others. The most obvious example of this can be seen in the fact that the major freeways/expressways/highways, major arterial streets/roads, minor arterial streets/roads, and collector streets/roads shown on the Regional Development Plan – Transportation
Future land use changes will be incorporated into the transportation modeling and planning process and, reflexively, changes in transportation plans will be incorporated into regional development planning, development standards, and zoning decisions.

Similarly, the land uses which are projected in the Regional Development Plan are being used for the countywide transportation model being developed through the I-25 Corridor project. The results of that model development and the model itself will, in turn, become an important transportation-planning tool for PACOG, local governments and districts within the PACOG Region. Future land use changes will be incorporated into the transportation modeling and planning process and, reflexively, changes in transportation plans will be incorporated into regional development planning, development standards, and zoning decisions. To the extent that both land development and transportation planning remain tightly interwoven in the future, the process will truly be deserving of the term “regional plan.”
Plan Implementation

The long-term success of the Pueblo Regional Development Plan rests largely on the techniques and programs selected by the Region to implement the Plan. A significant amount of work has been completed that sets forth the Region’s anticipated demand and land absorption needs for new residential, commercial, industrial, recreational and educational land uses through year 2030. Likewise, information has been collected that provides the Region with an assessment of the Region’s capacity to accommodate additional growth both from a land use and an environmental perspective. The Guiding Principles, Development Action Areas and Future Land Use address the overarching goals and objectives of the Plan, timing of development, infrastructure policies and appropriate land uses throughout the Region. The purpose of Plan Implementation is to provide a framework of potentially suitable techniques for implementing the Regional Development Plan.

Implementation Techniques

This section provides an assessment of various land use implementation techniques or programs grouped into three major categories: Infrastructure Techniques, Regulatory Techniques, and Miscellaneous Techniques. Each of these techniques or programs should be considered by the Region as a possible approach for implementing the Regional Development Plan. The techniques or programs discussed are:

- **Infrastructure Techniques**
  - Adequate Public Facilities Program
  - Capacity Allocation Program
  - Cost Recovery Program
  - Targeted Infrastructure Investment
  - Impact Fees
  - Special Districts
  - Priorities for Infrastructure

- **Regulatory Techniques**
  - Minimum Zoning Density Standards
  - Zoning Regulation Update or Amendments
  - Subdivision Regulations Update or Amendments
  - Residential Cluster Zoning
  - Overlay Zones
Miscellaneous Implementation Techniques

- Open Space Land Acquisition Program
- Downtown Business District Enhancement Programs
- Intergovernmental Agreements
- Redevelopment Authority

Public Facilities Financing Techniques

Adequate Public Facilities Program

An Adequate Public Facilities (APF) program requires that new development be approved only when and if adequate public facilities will be available to serve it at the time of actual development. In some states this is called a “concurrency” requirement, because it provides standards for ensuring that new facilities are available “concurrently” with the demands for those facilities created by new development. Basic APF criteria have long been part of Colorado’s Senate Bill 35, which governs county subdivision regulations; unfortunately, those criteria are often implemented loosely.

The purpose of an APF program is to ensure the availability of adequate public facilities for new development. It ensures that the off-site impacts of development are considered as part of the development approval process. It also ensures that new development will not negatively reduce current or future infrastructure levels of service.

An APF can be implemented separately or go hand-in-hand with the "Capacity Allocation Program" discussed below. However, an important difference between the programs is in the area of "control." In an APF, the developer must demonstrate that there are adequate off-site public facilities to accommodate the proposed development. If there are not, then the developer cannot go forward with the development until the developer provides the facilities. With the Capacity Allocation Program, the City or County "allocates" certain capacities to respective geographical areas and establishes when the City or County will provide those capacities or when it is appropriate for the development community to provide them.

Capacity Allocation Program

A Capacity Allocation Program (CAP) is a type of growth management that allocates scarce capacity in sewer, water or other public systems to new users in accordance with policies that implement the adopted land use plan. This program differs from an "Adequate Public Facilities" (APF) program primarily in how it uses "allocation" of public services to manage growth. Local government predetermines priority areas within its jurisdiction where it wishes to see growth and development occur, as has been done in this Plan.

Through a CAP, a community directs growth into areas that it considers its high priority growth sectors. This growth management tool puts...
the community in the "driver's seat" as to when and where growth will oc-
cur. This approach leads to a more systematic expansion of a community's
urban area and reduces the likelihood of growth occurring in a completely
random pattern based on individual development choices. It also provides
the community more predictability in determining future facility needs and
capacities.

A Capacity Allocation Program can be used in tandem with an APF. Once a certain sewer or water capacity is "allocated" to a specific geographic area, the APF could require that development not occur in unserved areas until the developer demonstrates that he or she can provide not only ade-
quate off-site water and sewer facilities, but also meet other adequate facil-
ity requirements such as roads, parks and fire protection.

**Cost Recovery Program**

A Cost Recovery Program is a payback fee or site-specific impact fee from which the revenues are used to reimburse a third party (usually an-
other developer) which paid the cost of extending sewer and/or water service necessary to serve the new development. It is easiest to apply to sewer and water systems but is occasionally used for major road or stormwater improvements.

One purpose of such a fee is to provide equity in allocating the costs of expanding systems by ensuring that all developments that benefit from an extension contribute to the cost of that extension. Another purpose is to provide developers or local government with an incentive to extend major water and sewer lines by providing them with a reasonable opportunity to recover part of the costs of that extension.

**Targeted Infrastructure Investment**

Local governments once actively built major roads and extended sewer and water lines in advance of need. Today, most local governments depend on developers to take the initiative to expand infrastructure to meet growth-related needs. Targeted Infrastructure Investment Policies require the city, county and other providers to get back into the business of provid-
ing some infrastructure in advance of need—but to do so in targeted areas, carefully coordinated with other service and facility providers.

**Impact Fees**

An impact fee is an exaction that requires that a developer pay a roughly proportional share of the cost of expanding those major off-site public facilities that will absorb the impacts of the project. Impact fees are commonly used for roads, water, sewer, stormwater and parks; sewer and water connection fees that exceed the costs of physical connections and in-
spections are essentially impact fees, although they actually predate most impact fees and often are called something else.
Special Districts

Special Districts under Colorado law can range from simple taxing districts affecting a limited geographical area within a larger jurisdiction, to specialized units of government (such as water and sewer districts) to full-fledged “metropolitan districts,” such as those that serve Pueblo West and Colorado City.

Special Districts provide the Region with a mechanism for funding area-specific improvements desired by some areas of the Region while not seen as priorities in other areas. An example of this would be a subdivision currently served by septic tanks that desires to be served by public sewer. Another type of improvement district could be created for the Downtown Business District for construction of a variety of improvements.

Priorities for Infrastructure

The city and county should each adopt plans and policies that place future infrastructure in four categories:

**High priority.** Infrastructure in this category would include infrastructure that is already needed or infrastructure that is part of the targeted infrastructure investment program. All elements on the 5-year CIP should be considered “high priority.”

**Medium priority.** Infrastructure that is on adopted long-range plans but not in the current CIP would fall in this category. Local governments should accept dedication of such infrastructure where a developer offers to provide it and should enter into cost recovery agreements to encourage developers to provide such infrastructure.

**Low priority.** Infrastructure that is generally consistent with adopted plans but for which there is no clear need and unlikely to be a clear need within 10 years. A local government might elect to accept dedication of such infrastructure if it is provided but would refuse to enter into cost recovery agreements for it or otherwise encourage its construction.

**Unwanted.** Some infrastructure will simply be inconsistent with the plan. This would be infrastructure that encourages a type of development inconsistent with that reflected on the Development Action Areas map or that encourages development in floodplains or other undesirable areas. Local governments should not approve any plans showing such infrastructure, nor accept its dedication. Recording instruments should be considered to warn purchasers that the public will not maintain their roads or other infrastructure.

Regulatory Techniques

**Minimum Density Standards**

The City and County could establish minimum densities, as well as the traditional maximum densities, in selected urban, suburban and ex-
urban zoning districts. For example, in an area that was served by existing sewer, the maximum size of any residential lot might be set at 15,000 square feet, thus prohibiting rural type development within areas that need to be reserved for urban densities.

This approach ensures that urban development is sufficiently dense to be viable, thus supporting appropriate infrastructure investments and neighborhood shopping, schools and parks. It also limits the pressure on rural land, by ensuring that more development is absorbed within the urban area.

**Zoning Regulation Update or Amendments**

Both city and county should consider updates or amendments to their respective zoning regulations. Those should focus on such issues as:

- Creating pedestrian-friendly development
- Creating transit-friendly development
- Encouraging mixed use in appropriate locations
- Encouraging redevelopment in designated areas
- Encouraging pedestrian-oriented development in urban mixed use areas, with public or clustered parking and minimal front setbacks
- Ensuring the protection of identified neighborhoods
- Ensuring that zoning for stable neighborhoods treats most existing buildings/uses as conforming uses, so they can be updated or replaced
- Protecting sites for future employment centers
- Enhancing the character of the Region’s gateway entries
- Ensuring that the rural character of the Region is maintained

**Subdivision Regulation Updates or Amendments**

Both city and county should consider updates or amendments to their respective zoning regulations. These should focus on:

- Establishing basic adequacy standards for improvements for all development
- Addressing issues of suburban development in rural areas
- Creating more pedestrian-friendly urban and suburban neighborhoods
- Implementing three tiers of infrastructure standards—urban, suburban and rural—with regard to existing and planned character of the area and with less regard to whether property is within city limits or not.

**Residential Cluster Zoning**

Also known as “open space subdivisions,” residential cluster zoning involves the adoption of design standards for use in certain rural and/or en-
Cluster Residential Zoning

- “clusters” development onto smaller lots away from “protected” areas, while leaving remaining area in open space, thus reducing development impact... existing permitted residential densities are maintained and can even allow density bonuses for employing the cluster technique.

The following is an example of how cluster residential might be used in Pueblo County on 2,000 acres zoned County A-1. The A-1 zoning permits 1 unit per 40 acres; total permitted units on 2,000 acres would be 50 houses. Cluster Residential would require this overall density to be maintained (50 units on 2,000 acres), but might permit lots to be reduced to 5 acres. This would leave 1,750 acres in commonly held open space owned by the homeowners (50 lots x 5 acres = 250 acres, minus 2,000 acres = 1,750 acres). The commonly held acres could not be further subdivided but would be large enough to be more useable for ranching purposes. Likewise, because the road network would be much more limited due to a smaller amount of being developed for home sites (250 acres versus 2,000), the cost to the developer and ultimately the County, for maintenance would be reduced. Added benefits would be maintaining more of the rural character of the County and having less impact on wildlife habitat corridors. It is also conceivable that some housing density bonus might be permitted for employing Cluster Residential Zoning. Also, this same technique works well for development near flood prone areas and more steep terrain.

Overlay Zones

Overlay zoning is a mapped zone that imposes a set of requirements and a review process over existing zoning districts. When an overlay zone is put into place it acts as a second layer of zoning to accomplish a specific purpose while maintaining the existing underlying zoning regulations. Pueblo County’s Zoning Ordinance provides for a Hazardous Wastes Industrial Overlay District. Other examples of overlay zones are flood hazard areas, historic districts and gateway entrance overlays. In most cases the underlying zoning requirements remain the same, however there is an additional set of development guidelines or requirements that must be followed if the subject property falls within an overlay zone. In some instances overlay zones may modify the existing zoning district requirements. As an example, a central business district overlay may reduce the traditional amount of parking required by a new development.

The purpose of overlay zoning is to provide an additional zoning tool to provide both flexibility and additional criteria for development in order to accomplish the policies of the Regional Development Plan. The Region may wish to consider the use of overlay zones in areas suitable for open space protection and greenway development. Other communities have developed overlay zones to protect property from development on unstable land (steep slopes); soil erosion and stream siltation; destruction of mature or unique vegetation or habitats; destruction of wetlands and prime agricultural
lands; pollution of the water supply resources; or incompatible development in established residential areas.

Miscellaneous Implementation Techniques

**Open Space Land Acquisition Program**

The City and County and, possibly, other entities, would actively seek to acquire fee and less-than-fee interests in selected lands in the city and county. Acquisition in fee simple gives the purchaser full title to and possession of all rights associated with the purchased property. Fee simple ownership provides the simplest and most effective means of effecting control: where government owns the land, government controls its development or preservation.

As an alternative to acquisition in fee simple, acquisition programs may seek to acquire easements. There are two distinct types of easements. Positive easements grant affirmative rights to use property in a specified manner. A right of access across a neighboring property is a common example of a positive easement. In contrast, negative easements affix restrictions upon the landowner's property rights. For example, where the aim is the preservation of scenic vistas, scenic easements may prevent new construction that exceeds height limitations or blocks specified views. Increasingly, non-profit land trusts are involved in acquiring properties for conservation purposes or in receiving conservation easements from landowners. In return, the landowner can take a substantial federal income tax deduction.

There has been increasing interest within the Pueblo Region for protecting productive agricultural land, flood plains, wildlife habitats and environmentally sensitive land. In fact, an overwhelming 96% of the respondents to a survey that was conducted as part of the Plan, agreed with the recommendation and 77% of them indicated a willingness to pay 5 cents per day to fund such programs. In the City of Boulder, Colorado, voters approved a specially earmarked 0.73 percent sales tax that has funded the purchase of 25,000 acres of dedicated open space to establish a greenbelt around the city.

**Downtown Business District Enhancement Programs**

Maintaining a viable Downtown Pueblo is important to the entire Region. Significant projects have been ongoing within the downtown, such as the HARP project and redevelopment and in-fill near Union Avenue. The overall purpose of the Downtown Business Enhancement Program is to reinvigorate the business climate of the Downtown by identifying the market niche the area could possibly capture of the Region's retail, office and residential uses. A healthy and appealing Downtown also serves to further stabilize and enhance the adjacent, long-established residential areas surrounding the Downtown. The HARP project should be used as a major building block for continuation of Downtown rehabilitation, redevelopment and in-fill.
**Intergovernmental Agreements**

Although included here, intergovernmental agreements do not represent a truly separate technique. They represent an effective way to coordinate implementation of most of the techniques listed here across jurisdictional boundaries—thus coordinating actions of schools and sewer providers, city and county, and special districts planning entities.

**Linking Implementation and Guiding Principles**

As an overview, the matrix provided below illustrates the relationship between the implementation techniques and the Regional Development Plan’s Guiding Principles. The relationship between the techniques or programs and the Plan’s Guiding Principles is important in order to maintain continuity throughout the planning process.

**Table 14 – Implementation Techniques, by Guiding Principles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Techniques</th>
<th>Guiding Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate Public Facilities Program</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Allocation Program</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Recovery Program</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeted Infrastructure Investment</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fees</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Districts</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities for Infrastructure</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Density Standards</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Update</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Update</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Cluster Zoning</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlay Zones</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Land Acquisition</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Enhancement</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = Primary Technique</td>
<td>S = Secondary Technique</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between the Implementation Techniques and the Plan’s Guiding Principles is important in order to maintain continuity throughout the planning process.
Continuation of Planning Efforts

Planning is part product and part plan. It is important that the delivery of this product not end the process. PACOG should consider a continuing planning coordination effort. One way to accomplish that would be to continue the Plan Management Committee and charge it to prepare an annual synthesis of “major planning policies” for use by appointed and elected officials in making decisions. The purpose of that effort would be to ensure that the school districts’ capital plans, capital improvement plans for the city, county, water board and metro districts, MPO transportation plan, the pending human services plan, annexation plans and this Regional Development Plan form the parts of a cohesive Regional Plan.
Resolutions Adopting Regional Plan

PACOG Resolution
Pueblo County Resolution
City of Pueblo Resolution
City of Pueblo Planning Commission Resolution