

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 2014  
COMMISSIONERS' CHAMBERS AT PUEBLO COUNTY COURTHOUSE  
215 WEST 10<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

**ROLL CALL AND DECLARATION OF QUORUM**

Commissioners Present: Betty Alt; Donald Bruestle; Ron Greenwell; Epimenio Griego; Kiera Hatton; Ronald Leyba; Philip Mancha; and Arnold VanZandt.

Commissioner Absent: Roger Lowe.

Staff Present: Joan Armstrong, Director; Sandy Blanco; Dominga Jimenez-Garcia; and Jeffrey Woeber.

Others Present: Marci Day, Assistant County Attorney; and Pat Coffee, County Public Works Department.

Chair Bruestle called the Pueblo County Planning Commission meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MAY 27, 2014 MINUTES**

Mr. VanZandt moved to approve the minutes of the May 27, 2014 meeting as mailed. Ms. Alt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT**

Chair Bruestle stated he had nothing to report.

**DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

The Director's Report was presented by Joan Armstrong. She requested the staff reports be made a part of the record of the proceedings.

(a) Acceptance of Map Amendments and/or Planned Unit Developments:

- [Map Amendment No. 2014-002](#) rezoning from the S-1 to the A-4 Zone District. The property is located approximately 650 feet north of the northeast corner of the intersection of Park Road and Miller Avenue, west of the Town of Rye.
- [Rose Bud Productions Planned Unit Development No. 2014-003](#) rezoning from the I-2 Zone District to a Planned Unit Development. The property is located at 2298 East State Highway 96.

(b) Correspondence--One piece of correspondence was distributed: E-mail from Beth Applegate, dated June 17, 2014, in opposition to Special Use Permit No. 2014-004.

(c) Continuance--None.

(d) Withdrawals--None.

(e) Board of County Commissioners' Action--Summary of actions taken on June 11, 2014 and June 23, 2014.

(f) Administrative Reviews:

- [Special Use Permit No. 2012-010 Amended](#) allows the construction and use of four (4) 60' x 100' – 4 feet deep concrete drying beds for storage and drying of solid residual in support of the existing Water Treatment Plant Operations in an R-5 Zone District.

The Commission accepted the Administrative Review, thereby approving the continuance of this permitted use with the existing conditions of approval, Directive to Staff to present a report at its June, 2015 meeting, and Other Requirement.

- [Special Use Permit No. 2013-009](#) allows an Office Building in an R-5 Zone District.

The Commission accepted the Administrative Review, thereby approving the continuance of this permitted use with the existing conditions of approval and notation

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 24, 2014**

stating it is unnecessary to schedule this special use permit for further review unless the use and/or property do not maintain compliance with the Pueblo County Code and/or a complaint is received and verified that there is a violation of the conditions of approval as imposed above, and/or if a review is specifically requested by the Planning Commission.

- [Special Use Permit No. 2013-010](#) allows the establishment of a monopole type telecommunications tower (with an overall height of 80 feet) and related accessory buildings and support facilities on a 1,600 square foot leased parcel of land in an A-2 Zone District.

The Commission accepted the Administrative Review, thereby approving the continuance of this permitted use with modified conditions of approval and a Directive to Staff to present a report at its September, 2014 meeting.

- [Special Use Permit No. 2013-011](#) allows establishment of a monopole type telecommunications tower (with an overall height of 80 feet) and related accessory buildings and support facilities on a 1,600 square foot leased parcel of land in an A-1 Zone District.

The Commission accepted the Administrative Review, thereby approving the continuance of this permitted use with modified conditions of approval and a Directive to Staff to present a report at its September, 2014 meeting.

Ms. Armstrong requested the Commission take action to accept the map amendment and planned unit development for processing, late correspondence, the Board of County Commissioners' action, and administrative reviews as presented.

Ms. Alt moved to accept the map amendment and planned unit development for processing, late correspondence, the Board of County Commissioners' action, and administrative reviews as read into the record and make the Commission's comments a part of the record of the proceedings. Mr. VanZandt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

**STATEMENT OF HEARING PROCEDURES BY CHAIRPERSON**

Chair Bruestle reported that the applicant and/or representative are called upon to speak, followed by any opposition, with the applicant having the final say.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

Ms. Armstrong explained there are three items on the Consent Agenda and four items on the Regular Agenda for this evening's meeting.

**CONSENT ITEMS:**

Mr. Griego moved to approve the three Consent Items listed below with comments, findings, and conditions. Ms. Alt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously.

- [Special Use Permit No. 2014-006](#), Bridger Wireless, c/o Julie Nelson, requests a special use permit for a 195-foot lattice type guyed telecommunications tower and related accessory buildings and support facilities on a 6,400 square foot leased parcel of land in an A-1 Zone District.

The Commission approved Special Use Permit No. 2014-006 with seven conditions of approval, and a Directive to Staff to present a report at its June, 2015 meeting. PCPC Resolution No. 14-020, dated June 24, 2014, was also approved.

- [Map Amendment No. 2014-002](#), David V. and Maggie H. Reineke, requests to rezone two lots, each 0.31± acre in size, from an S-1 to an A-4 Zone District.

The Commission voted to recommend approval of Map Amendment No. 2014-002 to the Board of County Commissioners with three findings.

- [Rose Bud Productions Planned Unit Development No. 2014-003](#), Richard Paradiso, requests to rezone land from an I-2 to the Rose Bud Productions Planned Unit Development.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 24, 2014**

The Commission voted to recommend approval of Rose Bud Productions Planned Unit Development No. 2014-003 to the Board of County Commissioners with three comments and eight conditions of approval.

**REGULAR ITEMS:**

**Statement of Conduct and Demeanor**

Chair Bruestle stated in order for the business of the Commission to be conducted in the most effective and expeditious manner, it is necessary that all persons present maintain a demeanor of civility toward each other. Uncivil conduct will not be tolerated. Such behavior shall constitute the forfeiture of a person's right to remain in attendance and may result in them being asked to leave the meeting by the chairperson or, upon their refusal, being escorted out of the meeting by the proper authority.

- [Declaration of Abandonment of Special Use Permit No. 2003-006](#), Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development, requests a Declaration of Abandonment due to the approved use of an aggregate extraction operation (gravel pit) on a 90.24± acre site located in an A-1 Zone District being established but discontinued for a period of five (5) or more years. The property is located approximately 2.75 miles west of the Pinon area of Pueblo County. The gravel pit is known as Big Pinon Pit.

Ms. Jimenez-Garcia, Planner II, Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development, summarized her staff review dated June 11, 2014, in a PowerPoint presentation. She stated the site is located 2.75 miles west of the Pinon area of the Walker Ranch. The 90.24± acre permit area is within two parcels totaling 640 acres in size and described as portions of Section 34, Township 19 South, Range 65 West of the 6<sup>th</sup> P.M. The permit was originally approved by the Planning Commission on March 25, 2003, with five conditions of approval and a Directive to Staff. It was reviewed and reissued on March 23, 2004, with the same five conditions of approval and notation stating the permit would be placed on a complaint basis only. It was discovered by staff the special use permit was still active, noting the associated reclamation permit that was issued on June 30, 2003, by the Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety, had released Robert Walker from further responsibility on August 20, 2007, for the Big Pinon Gravel Pit. The special use permit wasn't properly rescinded and the current owner notified staff they didn't contest the abandonment. Staff recommends the Planning Commission issue a Declaration of Abandonment of Special Use Permit No. 2003-006 due to the extraction and processing of natural deposits, more specifically aggregate extraction operation in an A-1 Zone District being established but discontinued for a period of five years or more.

There was no opposition to the Declaration of Abandonment of Special Use Permit No. 2003-006.

Chair Bruestle closed the hearing and entered staff's comments into the record.

Mr. VanZandt moved to approve the Declaration of Abandonment of Special Use Permit No. 2003-006. Mr. Leyba seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. PCPC Resolution No. 14-019, dated June 24, 2014, was also approved.

- [Declaration of Abandonment of Special Use Permit No. 2003-007](#), Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development, requests a Declaration of Abandonment due to the approved use of an aggregate extraction operation (gravel pit) on a 95.83± acre site located in an A-1 Zone District not established after a period of five (5) or more years. The property is located approximately one mile west of the Pinon area of Pueblo County. The gravel pit is known as Pepsi Pit.

Ms. Jimenez-Garcia, Planner II, Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development, summarized her staff review dated June 11, 2014, in a PowerPoint presentation. She stated the site is located approximately one mile west of the Pinon area on the Walker Ranch. The 95.83± acre permit area is within two parcels totaling 640 acres in size and described as portions of Section 35, Township 18 South, Range 65 West of the 6<sup>th</sup> P.M. The permit was originally approved by the Planning Commission on March 25, 2003, with five conditions of approval and a Directive to Staff. It was reviewed and reissued on March 23, 2004, with the same five conditions of approval and notation stating the permit would be placed on a complaint basis only. It was discovered by staff the special use permit was still active, noting the associated reclamation permit that was issued on July 24, 2003, by the Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety, had released Robert Walker from further responsibility

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 24, 2014**

on June 20, 2007, for the Pepsi Gravel Pit. The special use permit wasn't properly rescinded and the current owner notified staff they didn't contest the abandonment. Staff recommends the Planning Commission issue a Declaration of Abandonment of Special Use Permit No. 2003-007 due to the extraction and processing of natural deposits, more specifically aggregate extraction operation in an A-1 Zone District not being established after a period of five years or more.

There was no opposition to the Declaration of Abandonment of Special Use Permit No. 2003-007.

Chair Bruestle closed the hearing and entered staff's comments into the record.

Mr. VanZandt moved to approve the Declaration of Abandonment of Special Use Permit No. 2003-007. Mr. Greenwell seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. PCPC Resolution No. 14-018, dated June 24, 2014, was also approved.

- [Special Use Permit No. 2014-004](#), Jarrod Powers, High Country Fence, LLC, requests a special use permit to allow "bulk storage, selling, and fabricating of fencing materials" in the B-4 Zone District on a specifically designated 2.0 acre portion of Lot 1, West-Yorek Subdivision. The property is physically addressed as 6850 Colorado State Highway No. 165 West and is located on the south side of State Highway 165, east of Colorado Boulevard in the Colorado City area.

Ms. Jimenez-Garcia, Planner II, Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development, summarized the staff review dated June 16, 2014, in a PowerPoint presentation. She stated the site is proposed to be created as an independent parcel through the subdivision of the overall parcel, noting the preliminary plan is in the design stages and the applicant decided to pursue the special use permit until the subdivision proposal is ready for review and consideration. The two acre site is encompassed within a 17.62± acre parcel, noting a half-acre portion of the proposed area was previously included in a 2008 special use permit, which allowed bulk storage of landscaping materials that didn't negatively impact the surrounding properties or adversely affect the public health, safety, or welfare. On June 17, 2014, staff received an email from Beth Applegate, who is in opposition to the special use permit. She indicated they own four lots directly across Highway 165 from the proposed site, and felt the proposed activity will inhibit their ability to sell their lots. Staff recommends the Planning Commission approve Special Use Permit No. 2014-004 with six conditions of approval and a Directive to Staff to present a report at its June, 2015 meeting.

Mr. Daniel Wachob, Wachob & Wachob, Inc., #1 North Parkway, Colorado City, spoke in favor of the special use permit. He reported he is the representative for High Country Fence and MW Partners, LLC. They had an existing special use permit for this property, which was for sand, gravel, landscaping materials, dump trucks, and front end loaders. The existing owners are High Country Fence as opposed to High Country Trucking. High Country Fence is in the fence building business and not a retail business. They install barbed-wire, chain-link, and picket fencing. The fencing materials go to their job sites the majority of the time, and the stored materials might be leftovers from a project like fence posts, wire, or a machine that digs holes. The office is located in the shopping center adjacent to the site. In response to the letter of opposition, the sale of the lots would be more impacted by the fact there is no sewer, water, or a road. The proposed business is a good use for the property and good for Colorado City, noting they need all the businesses they can get. The recommendations from staff are valid and will meet all of them.

Mr. Leyba questioned the special use permit that was granted in 2008 and rescinded in 2014, and what items were contained in the bulk storage. Mr. Wachob replied High Country Trucking provided gravel, sand, dirt, building materials, landscape materials, and mulch. They trucked anything they could and stored a lot of the materials for retail sale. The proposed special use permit would be less of an impact than the one approved in 2008.

There was no opposition to Special Use Permit No. 2014-004.

Chair Bruestle closed the hearing and entered staff's comments into the record.

Ms. Hatton moved to approve Special Use Permit No. 2014-004. Ms. Alt seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously. PCPC Resolution No. 14-017, dated June 24, 2014, was also approved.



**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 24, 2014**

- [Special Use Permit No. 2014-005](#), Robert Lucero, requests a special use permit to allow a medical marijuana center, medical marijuana-infused products manufacturer, retail marijuana store, and retail marijuana-infused products manufacturer in the B-1 Zone District. The marijuana business, The Other Spot, would be in the existing building addressed as 2025 Independence Drive in Blende. The property contains 0.34 acre and is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Independence Drive and Eagle Street.

Ms. Joan Armstrong, Director, Pueblo County Department of Planning and Development, summarized her staff review dated June 16, 2014, in a PowerPoint presentation. She stated the site is approximately 400 feet south of Santa Fe Drive in Blende, and immediately west and south of Mission Foods. The property is improved with a building that was used for a bakery in the B-1 Zone District. The property to the north is zoned R-3; the property to the east contains Mission Foods, truck parking, and maneuvering, in the B-4; and the property to the south is zoned R-3. The residential area of Blende is zoned R-3 and the properties fronting on Santa Fe Drive, which is also Highway 50, are zoned B-4. The Mission Foods Production Facility is in the I-2 Zone District, and the remaining property, as previously stated, is zoned B-4 and used for truck parking and maneuvering. Staff received several phone calls in opposition, noting the main objection was the proposed use of marijuana. Another objection was to the traffic, and staff indicated it could have the same amount of traffic as the previous business being a bakery. The same person commented on the semi-truck traffic for Mission Foods with respect to using the immediate surrounding roads instead of Highway 50, which has a bigger impact on the road system. The adjacent owners map depicted as Exhibit 6b of staff's review may help identify the location of the homes in relationship to the subject property. It identifies the owners within a 300-foot distance that were mailed the public notice. The Planning Commission is given the opportunity to consider the compatibility of the proposed use with surrounding uses, and may also impose a reasonable condition to insure consistency with the character of the area to minimize impacts.

Mr. Greenwell reported he went to the site and was approached by a resident who asked him some questions. He notified the resident that he was unable to answer any questions being a member of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Joseph Gagliano, Gagliano Engineering, 1740 Eagleridge Boulevard, Unit 150, spoke in favor of the special use permit. He stated he is the representative for the applicant, Mr. Robert Lucero. They reviewed staff comments and have no objections. They also noted the opposition and reserved any further comments until he hears from them. Mr. VanZandt asked Mr. Gagliano if there would be sufficient parking. Mr. Gagliano replied yes, noting the retail portion of the business would have similar parking requirements that the previous bakery had. Ms. Hatton questioned how many employees would be at the location, and Mr. Gagliano replied not more than three or four. Ms. Hatton questioned why they chose this site being heavily residential, and Mr. Gagliano replied it was available. Mr. Greenwell stated when he went to the site he saw quite a few children playing in the area on their bicycles, noting it's both residential and business.

Mr. Sam Salvo, 2020 Independence Drive, spoke in favor of the special use permit. He stated he currently purchased his home, which is directly across the street from the proposed site. He doesn't have a problem with the proposed use, but is worried about having a vacant building across the street. He worked with Mr. Lucero in the landscaping business and doesn't think he would be running a fly-by-night business. There are kids in the area, but it's a residential neighborhood. The biggest problem with the traffic is from Mission Foods. He doesn't think the traffic would increase, and Mr. Lucero informed him he would have security and cameras. He talked to the Sheriff's Department and worked with the County on the speeding issue to put up speed limit signs. The proposed use won't improve the neighborhood, but it won't hurt the value of it either. Mr. Lucero indicated he was going to paint and redo the parking lot, noting it's a nice neighborhood, with ample parking on three sides of the building. Mr. Griego asked Mr. Salvo if he lived in the area or was renting out his home. Mr. Salvo replied he purchased the home to rent it out but decided to sell it.

Mr. Mike Rodriguez, 1910 Independence, spoke in opposition to the special use permit. He stated he lives four houses away from the proposed site, noting he's been there for 18 years. The house he lives in has been in the family for 35 years, and his nephew and family live next door. His elderly mother just moved here last week from California and resides at 1825 Independence. He voted in favor of legalizing marijuana because he felt people had the right to do what they wanted. His objection has nothing to do with the marijuana, but with the location, which is the neighborhood. If the Commission could guarantee that every

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 24, 2014**

tax dollar made from the marijuana sales was put back into the Blende neighborhood, he might think about agreeing to it. If they could guarantee their safety and their quality of life wouldn't change, he might agree. He completely disagrees, noting it's a neighborhood with a lot of senior citizens and young families. There are dispensaries on Santa Fe Drive, which is okay because they're surrounded by businesses and they have no control. Mission Foods is on the corner, and 10 years ago they approached the County Commissioners and the Sheriff's Department to put up stop signs. Every intersection of the neighborhood has a stop sign because the semis would fly through there without stopping. They were also assured that the semis, delivery trucks, and vendors from Mission Foods wouldn't go down their streets, and anytime they see these vehicles going down their streets, they're supposed to report it to the plant. Mr. VanZandt asked Mr. Rodriguez how close he lived to the proposed site. Mr. Rodriguez replied four houses down on the other side of the street.

Mr. Dean Grinstead, 2029 Liberty Drive, spoke in opposition to the special use permit. He stated he's against the proposed site for retail sales, noting the site is visible from his front porch. He lived there for 12 years, noting it's a family neighborhood with very quiet neighbors. There would be increased traffic, noting if the use was for a bar or liquor store he would still be opposed. A cake facility was there with not a lot of traffic and the only affect it had on the neighborhood was the smell of cakes. The parking is an issue for the neighborhood, noting there's not a lot of street parking. The safety of the kids is a concern, noting they ride their bikes in the neighborhood and go for walks. Chair Bruestle asked Mr. Grinstead how much street frontage he had. Mr. Grinstead replied from his front step to the curb is ten feet. Chair Bruestle stated he was referring to the width of the lot. Mr. Grinstead replied it's very narrow, maybe 15 feet. Mr. Griego stated the houses and the lots are very small and narrow in the area. Ms. Alt asked Mr. Grinstead when he moved to the property. Mr. Grinstead replied in 1999, noting they moved because the house was too small with three children. They could never sell it so they kept it in the family. Ms. Alt questioned if when they bought the home if the bakery was established, and Mr. Grinstead replied yes.

Mr. Robert Brown, 2032 Liberty Drive, spoke in opposition to the special use permit. He stated he owns the property behind the proposed site. Independence Drive and Eagle Street get a lot of truck and employee traffic, and they don't care about slowing down. There are a lot of whiskey bottles, beer cans, and trash at the site, noting they need some trash control. There are two or three children that ride their bikes and circle the building almost every night. If they don't allow a facility next to a grade school, why would they allow it in a neighborhood with children? He is not opposed to marijuana shops, but this is not a good place for one. If it was on the other side of Mission Foods where all the businesses are, it might be different. There are employees from Mission Foods who park in the street, eat their lunch, and throw their trash out of the window. They have enough trash and a lot of kids, and asked the Commission to consider the kids. Mr. VanZandt asked Mr. Brown how many kids lived in the neighborhood. Mr. Brown replied there are two directly across the street and a baby next door. He doesn't know where the kids live that ride their bikes around the building.

Chair Bruestle stated when they have a lot of people that want to speak in favor or in opposition to something, it's helpful if the speaker could offer different testimony than the previous speaker did, noting he understands their concerns but they want to gather more information.

Ms. Virginia Rodriguez, 1910 Independence Drive, spoke in opposition to the special use permit. She stated she took pictures of the neighborhood today, and entered them into the record as "Opposer's Exhibit A". She went to Marisol Therapeutics and within one hour saw 31 vehicles, with 12 of them being employees. This is a real neighborhood with children. She plans on being there in her golden years, but they won't be very fun. She has been fighting Mission Foods for 18 years on the semi-trucks, noting nobody has done anything about them or the trash. She has a neighbor who owns a boat and the tags have been expired for seven years. She talked to the County Commissioners and nothing has been done. If they approve this permit, their issues will never be resolved. She has invested over \$100,000 into her home and has concerns. Mr. VanZandt asked Ms. Rodriguez where the trash comes from. Ms. Rodriguez replied Mission Foods, noting she talked to the supervisor many times and he said it wasn't his problem. If they approve the marijuana business, what other issues are they going to have on top of what is already there?

Ms. Cynthia Vigil, 1815 Liberty Drive, spoke in opposition to the special use permit. She stated she lives two blocks down on Liberty Drive and has lived there for 50 years. Her kids are the ones who ride their bikes and take their dog for walks at the site, noting it's their daily dog run. It is a good neighborhood with a lot of kids.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 24, 2014**

Mr. Robert Lucero, 748 East Industrial Boulevard, Pueblo West, stated he's the owner of the property and would like to withdraw his request for the special use permit. He agrees with all the people, noting they're limited to certain areas and met all of the criteria, but he understands the concerns because he has kids and grandkids.

Ms. Armstrong asked Mr. Lucero if he was withdrawing his special use permit application, and Mr. Lucero replied yes. Chair Bruestle stated for the record that Mr. Robert Lucero has withdrawn his request for Special Use Permit No. 2014-005.

Chair Bruestle closed the hearing and entered staff's comments into the record.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

Comprehensive Plan Update.

Ms. Armstrong stated they are working with Beritt Odom, Senior Planner, City Planning Urban Renewal; Scott Hobson, Assistant Manager, Planning and Community Development; and Laurie Cozzetto, Manager, Pueblo West Metropolitan District, Community Development. Ms. Odom is going to give an update on the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Odom presented a PowerPoint presentation. She stated there are two primary reasons for the update. The existing plan was dated 2000 and adopted in 2002. The information contained in the existing Comprehensive Plan was based on the 2000 Census data, noting most of the projections and assumptions for residential development and employment demands were based on expedient growth that occurred in the late 1990s and early 2000. The second reason for the update is due to the Pueblo Metropolitan Planning Organization's Federal Law Requirement to prepare a long range transportation plan that extends to the year 2040. The long range transportation plan is largely based on demographic information and the land use designations, which are contained in the County's Comprehensive Plan. The existing plan doesn't extend to the year 2040, so they have to update it. The City and County staff came together in 2011 and, due to budget constraints, came to the conclusion it wasn't feasible to redo the entire plan at that time. Therefore, staff chose to update two key portions of the Plan. The first portion is the factual foundation, which is mostly demographic information and projections based on trends. The second portion is the future land use section, which mostly deals with the land use map.

Ms. Odom stated the update is an addendum to the existing Comprehensive Plan, and won't take the place of any original information in the Plan. They are going to go through the existing Plan and highlight or footnote the sections that will be updated, noting everything will be based on the 2010 demographic information. They won't touch on every section of the factual foundation and won't go into the park development or school portion of the Plan. It's mostly population and employment trends, noting the first section is the demographic update. The 2014 Comprehensive Plan population projection is extended to the year 2040, as opposed to the original 2030 projection. In the 2002 Comprehensive Plan, the population projection for 2010 is very similar to the actual population for the City, County, and overall. Therefore, based on those trends, there isn't a huge change in the overall population growth for 2040. The second portion they're updating is the housing type and growth, noting those trends haven't dramatically changed either. The single-family development will continue to experience the most growth out of the duplex, townhouse, and multi-family units. Pueblo County is projected to experience higher growth than the City, with more than half of the single-family units developed. The job growth is where they experienced more differences than what was contained in the original Comprehensive Plan. The original Comprehensive Plan projections for the service and retail industry projected a 146% increase to the year 2030. Another area where they dropped significantly was in construction. In the 2002 Comprehensive Plan, they projected a 157% growth in the construction, and now they're at 71%. Another portion of the factual foundation is the capacity. They went through a rigorous methodology of analyzing the entire County for public lands, eaves, slopes, rivers, and valleys, taking them out of the land that's available for development. They decided not to completely redo what was available for capacity, and are just looking at the changes in demand. The original Comprehensive Plan provided an analysis of available land for the housing and employment demand. The available land hasn't changed, but the employment demand has decreased dramatically. The 2002 Comprehensive Plan indicated a demand for 73,262 new jobs in 2030, and now they're saying the demand would only be 28,872 new jobs in 2040.

Ms. Odom stated the City had a few annexations and most of the change was for residential land. The industrial and commercial annexations haven't changed at all. The unincorporated areas and small towns have more capacity for residential development, and the City has more capacity for industrial and commercial development based on the current zoning and the land

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 24, 2014**

use map. The second portion of the Plan that's going to be updated is the Regional Development Plan, that's specifically the future land use map. It has two sections, noting the first one isn't used that much so they decided not to address it and to look specifically at the future land use map. The purpose of the land use map is to protect the public health, safety, and welfare of the community by identifying the location of compatible land uses. It is also used to facilitate the decision-making process with regard to zoning for the local governing bodies. The third reason for updating the land use map is to provide an analysis for current and future transportation trip generations for the MPO's travel demand model, which is a requirement of the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan. A lot of the changes to the land use map are based on the demographic information they updated, and the preferred development patterns and areas where they would like to see growth. Most of the changes in Pueblo West deal with the Highway 50 Corridor, noting most of the area was residential and changed to a commercial arterial designation, which seemed appropriate. Another big change in the County is south of the river and the Pueblo Reservoir in the Country Residential area. They had a higher residential land use designation and decided it would be more appropriate for lower density development because of its location and vicinity to the natural areas and the landfill. Ms. Armstrong stated the north part is the Stonemoor Hills area off the highway by Valco Lakes. Ms. Odom stated they're looking at the expansion of some industrial and rural ranch areas. The City's annexation for Vestas incorporated changes to the City and County. Another change to the County is east, south of the airport, noting they expanded the Country Residential to allow for lower density of land uses in that area.

Chair Bruestle questioned the extortion the City is facing with the Pueblo Springs Ranch and how that fits in. Mr. Hobson replied the future land use designation for the Pueblo Springs Ranch and the North Pueblo Special Development Area is included as a future Special Development Area that would need to be in the master plan and looked at on an individual basis. Instead of identifying and designating the land uses shown throughout the rest of the Plan, it's left as a Special Development Area because some areas may not be suitable for development. The unincorporated areas between Pueblo Springs Ranch and the University can't be looked at separately, and it all ties together. They chose to keep it as a Special Development Area rather than designate Urban Residential, Suburban Residential, or any other type of land use. It was established as an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan in the 2004 or 2005 timeframe, and both the City Council and the Pueblo County Planning Commission amended the North Pueblo Special Development Area to make it more inclusive. It originally followed a segment of the Fountain Creek Corridor and included the Pueblo Springs Ranch area and not the other private properties north of the University, extending up towards Pinon. The amendment was approved in 2007 by both the City and County. Mr. VanZandt questioned if there had been any progress. Mr. Hobson replied the City was contacted by the new owners, noting there are three owners for the 20,000 acres. They had some preliminary discussions with the City Planning Department on submitting new annexation petitions. The petitions that were filed previously were terminated, noting if no activity occurs on the annexation within a certain period of time, the application becomes null and void. There have been some discussions, but they don't have any formal petitions or a pre-annexation agreement.

Mr. Hobson stated the Pueblo MPO, the transportation division of PACOG, establishes transportation analysis zones. There are certain criteria with the population and number of jobs that are put together to create the zones. They are different than census tract zones, noting with the 2010 census data, the Federal Census Division downloads and inputs all the census data into the transportation analysis zones and they use it for their long range transportation planning. The purpose of the future land use map is to be able to designate land uses that can be aggregated into the transportation analysis zones. The Urban Residential has an average of four residential developments per acre, and each residential development would generate 10 vehicle trips, noting those numbers get input into long range plans. They also look at it for commercial development and industrial areas. They all have formulas and look at 2020, 2030, and 2040, as far as the impacts on traffic and where they need to prioritize. They look at the urbanized areas of Pueblo West, Blende, and most of the City. They have had a lot of cooperation from the County Planning staff and Ms. Cozzetto in Pueblo West. The 2000 Plan has urban residential on three sides of the landfill, which isn't likely to occur by 2040. They look at how it's scaled down and stay Rural Ranch around the landfill to accommodate some Urban Residential growth. In the area by Stonemoor Hills, some of it was either Urban or Suburban Residential and was scaled back to be Country Residential-type development. There were conservation easements that preserved some of those lands. The current Plan shows a lot of Urban Residential and Suburban Residential development, noting it doesn't seem to be the character of the way the area is developing. There is more Commercial development along the highway and some Industrial uses as they get closer to the river. The areas in Pueblo West along the U.S. 50 Corridor had more Residential development than what might actually develop there.



**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 24, 2014**

Mr. Mancha questioned the demographics with respect to employment and whether or not it would increase with the land usage. Mr. Hobson stated the question is if there was anything they could do from a future land use perspective to identify areas that could accommodate more jobs through the long range planning process and to set the land use tone to potentially improve their future job prospects. The answer is they need to look at where appropriate sites could be for the average, light, and medium level of Industrial development, and to encourage sites that might be more accommodating. They would see more Industrial areas identified in the Plan, noting the 2000 Plan didn't have that many areas identified. At the time, there was a lot of projection for Residential growth and service Commercial retail-type jobs being developed in the County, which hasn't been the case. When they get into the public review process for the update, the GIS Departments of the City and County will have maps depicting what the old map looks like and what the existing map looks like to see the difference between what's proposed and what's existing. They are open for adjustments to the final adopted update, noting they spent a lot of time coming up with the future land use map. Ms. Odom stated they have the capacity for job development. They have a lot of land that's already zoned and designated for Commercial and Industrial development, but are coming to the conclusion the population growth is growing more in the retirement age and younger children. They don't have the working population they assumed in the 2002 Comprehensive Plan, which is where they're getting the dramatic changes between the 2002 Comprehensive Plan and the updated Plan. The demand for employment isn't there based on the population growth, retirement factor, and the younger population. Mr. Greenwell questioned if the people retiring were coming here to retire or if the existing population was retiring. Ms. Odom replied she didn't know, noting they took the data from the 2010 Census and the DOLA projections. Mr. Hobson stated it's a combination of people selecting Pueblo County as a place to retire, and the people that are already here.

Mr. Mancha questioned if there was a vision or was it just a matter of looking at the current data and making the decisions. Ms. Odom replied they started the process in 2011 and one of the exercises was to look at a new vision and an entirely new Comprehensive Plan. They ran into several road blocks and were given the direction by City Council to not pursue an overall update to the Comprehensive Plan at that point due to several reasons. They are only looking at data with the addendum, but are open to looking at a new Comprehensive Plan with a new vision at some point, which is something they can continue to work on. They would have to hire a consultant, noting they can only do so much at the staff level. Mr. Mancha questioned if these were 10-year plans. Ms. Odom replied they follow the census, noting they're right in the middle. Ms. Alt stated she likes things on paper, noting the PowerPoint presentation is gone. Ms. Armstrong stated she would print the presentation out and mail it to the Commission members. Ms. Odom stated they're still in draft with more revisions to make, but are hoping to take the addendum to the City Planning and Zoning Commission in August, 2014, for adoption by the City. The City, County, and PACOG all have to adopt it, noting it has to be passed by an ordinance and would have two readings. Ms. Armstrong stated it would be brought back before the Planning Commission in August, 2014, and to the Board of County Commissioners and PACOG in September, 2014.

Mr. Greenwell thanked everybody for their work, noting everybody is trying to do their very best in helping the growth of Pueblo and Pueblo County. He is concerned about the historical growth pattern, and as a citizen, doesn't know what they can do to change it. Chair Bruestle stated in the 1980s they lost quite a few jobs and the economy wasn't nearly as diversified as it is now with the types of jobs they have in the community. They are not growing very quickly, but they still grow. Ms. Cozzetto stated the business growth is exceeding in Pueblo West, noting they have quite a few perspective retailers coming in and are hoping to get some new jobs. The commercial end of growth in Pueblo West is looking a bit better and they're seeing an upswing in residential building.

**NEW BUSINESS**

None.

**REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

None.

**RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS  
PUEBLO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
JUNE 24, 2014**

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Bruestle adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Joan Armstrong". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Joan Armstrong, Director  
Department of Planning and Development

SJB