

**Pueblo County UDC - Consolidated Draft Comment Summary (September 2024)**

<b>Comments received on Consolidated Draft UDC during the month of August</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Response</b>
Recommendations related to wildlife and public lands/recreation access related to Solar Facilities (letter from Steve Witte)	1041 Regulations (Solar)	Language modified to reflect spirit of the recommendations that were provided, along with review criteria to align with those included for other types of 1041 applications.
At the public meeting in Pueblo West Aug 20, 2024 a comment was made about the size of some of these outbuildings being erected in residential areas. I think the best way to handle it would be to put a square foot limit on out buildings in RR zoning. Something like 2400 square feet might be an appropriate size limit. WE don't need people running construction business out of their homes in residential neighborhoods .	Accessory Buildings	No change. The size of accessory structures is regulated by setbacks and lot coverage restrictions in the underlying zoning, as well as the use-specific standards in 17.03.040(b)(2)(ii), which impose further limitations.
This is the best solution and should be the focus for this community.	Agriculture	General comment. No change necessary.
This definition is quite different from the USDA Definition of a Feed Lot. I suggest having synergy between the nationally accepted definitions for these types of terms, to avoid confusion.	Agriculture	Definitions have been updated to align with state regulations for animal feeding operations (AFOs) and confined animal feeding operations, which account for feeding operations used for purposes other than slaughter.
According to the USDA and the fact that we are a right to farm state your language needs to follow the below definitions. "The USDA defines a feedlot as a confined area where cattle are fed to produce carcasses that meet the USDA's quality grade Select or better for slaughter. Feedlots are the final stage of cattle production and are also known as Concentrated (or Confined) Animal Feeding Operations (CAFOs) In animal husbandry, a concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO), as defined by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), is an intensive animal feeding operation (AFO) in which over 1,000 animal units are confined for over 45 days a year."	Agriculture	Definitions have been updated to align with state regulations for animal feeding operations (AFOs) and confined animal feeding operations, which account for feeding operations used for purposes other than slaughter.
Residentail Cluster should be required to augment because they will begin to use more then just "one" domestic home and ground water is going to be over-used.	Conservation Development	No change. The County does not control wells.
No matter the size, every time a dwelling structure is placed on historically "Ag" land, its no longer Ag land. Farming chopped up little fragments of land isn't farming.	Conservation Development	The County does not have the authority to prohibit the subdivision of private property.
Who determines what "prime" is?	Conservation Development	The AGO overlay was developed as part of the Regional Comprehensive Plan process, in conjunction with the Palmer Land Trust. "Prime" in this context is based on USDA data. Clarified language to tie back to AGO.
What about any productions that are "grandfathered-in". Why must the farmer put up a fence if they've historically already been in an area. It should be the residential people who should have to put up a fence - CO is, after all a "Fence-out" state. That should apply here too, if the new residents don't want to hear and see the agricultural production they elected to move out by.	Conservation Development	Revised to clarify intent that this is to apply to new residential development clusters, not existing agricultural uses.
Is there a definition for Livestock?	Definitions	Added definition (with minor adjustments) to align with state defintion.
NO!! As lights burn out they should be replaced by CONFORMING lights and fixtures. This will slowly bring the county into compliance.	Lighting	Clarified language regarding replacement of bulbs during two-year compliance window.
What about the lights that are NON CONFORMING right now as of 08/30/24?	Lighting	No Change. Nonconforming lighting on lots containing a single-family or two-unit dwelling shall be brought into compliance with the shielding requirements of §17.04.040(h)(1) within two years of the Effective Date.

Pueblo County UDC - Consolidated Draft Comment Summary (September 2024)

Criminal or Civil- Class 1, 2 or 3 Misdemeanor??	Lighting	No change. County exploring changes to the citation process to improve efficiency/effectiveness (outside the UDC process)
Holiday Lighting is NOT a problem in fact it is preferred. Should be kept on most of the winter instead of the standard bright lights.	Lighting	No change. Intended for nuisance situations.
Let people keep their Christmas lighting on all night you absolute Grinches	Lighting	No change. Intended for nuisance situations.
The old electrical and mechanical code for deficiencies called for a \$100.00 a day fine while the deviation existed. There is absolutely no specifics in 17.12.020 to keep people from violating it! This UDC has no enforceability specified.	Lighting	No change. Chapter 17.11 specifies enforcement provisions. Electrical and mechanical codes are building codes, which are administered by the Pueblo Regional Building Department.
It should read: A complete lighting unit consisting of a lamp or lamps together with the parts designed to distribute the light. STOP! The rest is superfluous or the rest is just a new sentence.	Lighting	Fixed punctuation
A useful scale to measure the color of a light bulb. It is based on the temperature of a steel blast furnace. The cooler the temperature the more yellow a light will be emitted. The hotter the temperature the brighter the white light will be emitted.	Lighting	General comment. No change necessary.
Why is this BURIED in the definitions?	Lighting	All terms are defined in the definitions section.
Order of purpose should be 1, 4, 3, 2. People will complain THEY WANT bright lights and use security as there excuse. They will blind people driving or walking by with there obnoxious lights.	Lighting	General comment. No change necessary. Purpose statements are not listed in order of importance.
Number 6 AOK.	Lighting	General comment. No change necessary.
Five Years is WAY TO LONG. May I suggest 1 year instead. This county is full of very difficult people. They just want to light pollute and don't care what any body else thinks about it.	Lighting	Updated to two years to allow adequate time for education and outreach.
It should state in the applicability that all new lights should be full cut-off fixtures.	Lighting	Applicability statements are not regulations. Standards are below.
'Objectionable light' appears to be too ambiguous and unenforceable.	Lighting	Added 'trespass' to clarify
Should include all WALLPAC and PANEL LED light sources. They are truly offensive and obnoxious. Low or High Pressure Sodium is passable since it gives off an orange light. This is filterable to any astronomer.	Lighting	No change. All types of lighting must meet the requirements of the UDC.
A lot of the "new" lights are Light Emitting Diodes. They are far brighter than any of the old incandescent or florescent lighting devices. They are obnoxious and should be restricted by the UDC. Many business' are installing retrofitted LED wall pacs and panels and the really are blinding as you drive by.	Lighting	No change. All types of lighting must meet the requirements of the UDC.
3i should be the standard for all wall mounted fixtures directly aimed at people and automobiles. 3ii should be the standard for parking lots only and the should be no confusion between the two provisions.	Lighting	Clarified language to distinguish.
A lumen is a foot-candle. Do you really want 900 foot-candle lighting on a flag? The Federal Code states that a US flag be illuminated but it does not say how it will be done.	Lighting	NO CHANGE This explanation is not accurate - 1 footcandle is equivalent to 1 lumen <b>per square foot</b> , so the only time a lumen is equal to a footcandle is when a light is mounted one foot above the ground. Since flag poles are often ~20 feet above the ground- with a 900 lumen fixture, you're looking at 2.5 footcandles, not 900.

Pueblo County UDC - Consolidated Draft Comment Summary (September 2024)

<p>A lumen is a foot-candle. Do you really want 1300 foot-candle lighting on a flag? The Federal Code states that a US flag be illuminated but it does not say how it will be done. This standard is ridiculously high.</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>NO CHANGE This explanation is not accurate - 1 footcandle is equivalent to 1 lumen <b>per square foot</b>, so the only time a lumen is equal to a footcandle is when a light is mounted one foot above the ground. Since flag poles are often ~20 feet above the ground- with a 1300 lumen fixture, you're looking at 3.25 footcandles, not 1300. The 1,300 lumen fixture is an uplight so it would contribute to the overall footcandle readings around the light, but not by much since most of the light is concentrated upward.</p>
<p>Where is the lighting scientist? A foot-candle is defined as the amount of light emanating from a standard candle one foot away. It shall be measured on a point of a sphere (x, y, and z axis) one foot away and defined as 1 foot-candle. English vs. Metric - 1 lumen equals 1 foot-candle. Your definition needs improvement.</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>No change. This explanation is not accurate - 1 footcandle is equivalent to 1 lumen <b>per square foot</b>, so the only time a lumen is equal to a footcandle is when a light is mounted one foot above the ground</p>
<p>It should really say while the business is close during night time hours lights should be off. For example, if a business closes at like 8:00PM then the lights should be OFF at 8:00PM.</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>Current language is consistent with suggestion.</p>
<p>There should be NO exemptions because "beauty is in the eye of the inspector." This give the inspector to much leeway in determination of light pollution. Look at Complaint ZV-24-93 through ZV-24-96. All glaring examples of light pollution but still allowed to exist. All 4 SPRAY there light on my property!</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>General comment. No change necessary.</p>
<p>FIVE YEARS!!!! This is totally unacceptable. Mrs. Carmen Howard you promised me it would get better under this UDC. Be a person of your word and quit this soft touch policy. It should be cut down to 12 months. Homeowners with obnoxious lights will forget about it and never change there lights.</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>Updated to two years to allow adequate time for education and outreach.</p>
<p>It should state all Commercial, Industrial, and Residential operations if lights are offensive they will be retrofitted and soon as practical. If not commercial operators will IGNORE these provisions and keep on light polluting. That is just the way things are in this county.</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>General comment. No change necessary.</p>
<p>You can light plan all you want but unless a light meter measurements are below 0.1 foot-candles this means nothing. Case in point Henry Burunga's Wolf Pac Marijuana plane on Enterprize Drive in Pueblo West. Even after modification the place comes in at 0.4 foot-candles. 4 times the legal limit. The place has been out of operation for the last 2 years!</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>General comment. No change necessary.</p>
<p>Yes Puebloplex it is very possible given the right fixtures are installed. Your place will be very comfortable to look at.</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>General comment. No change necessary.</p>
<p>Any thing above 2701K has far to much blue white light component to its illumination. That UV will burn our retinas with long term exposure.</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>No change required. 3,000K is at the top end of the warm spectrum.</p>
<p>This used to be for parking lots only and not full operations.</p>	<p>Lighting</p>	<p>General comment. No change necessary. Existing lighting requirements do not distinguish parking from "illuminated area." <a href="https://county.pueblo.org/planning-and-development-department/chapter-17120-supplementary-regulations-F-Maximum-Light-Levels">https://county.pueblo.org/planning-and-development-department/chapter-17120-supplementary-regulations F. Maximum Light Levels.</a></p>

**Pueblo County UDC - Consolidated Draft Comment Summary (September 2024)**

There is another place that stated 5 minutes of on time. To be consistent this to should say 5 minutes regardless of motion detector installation.	Lighting	Updated 17.04.040(j), Security Lighting, for consistency.
So a pedestrian or motor vehicle is not blinded by the filament of the light fixture.	Lighting	General comment. No change necessary.
I can travel between Purcell Blvd. and McCullough Blvd. on Hwy 50, and point out a myriad of buildings that were conforming under the old code but NOW they have been modified and have become NON conforming. Does this mean that all the NON conforming magically are "grandfathered" in just because a new code is written? Please just look at all the blue white lights BLARING at drivers from these buildings.	Lighting	No change. See 17.10.090 Non Conforming Lighting.
I know of a business that installed there floodlight ABOVE their canopy at there front door entrance.	Lighting	No change. The requirement states that the light must be below the canopy.
Pg 358 existing public schools adding a structure/administrative review only.	Location and Extent Review	No change needed based on discussion.
Pg 357 30 day limit on recording may not happen due to surveyor hold ups. Remove timeline or adjust to say after the plat has been accepted for recording.	Location and Extent Review (5) Post-decision Actions	Adjusted to say "after plat has been accepted for recording.
Truck parking incentive?	Parking	Flexibility is already allowed through Administrative Adjustment. No change based on discusion with staff.
8-16-24, made the following comment: I would suggest you leave out number (4). Most lots in Colorado City are NOT half an acre. You state in (1) Overnight camping shall be allowed on residential property with access to a private yard, then turn around in (4) and disallow their use on most lots in Colorado City. We've been allowing RV's to be on any lot in Colorado City for years as long as there is a residence. This is going to create considerable discontent	Primitive Camping	Removed half acre minimum
(j) Primitive Camping: 8-16-24, also made the following suggestion: Looking at what happens around Colorado City in the summer with grandparents visiting, I would change (3) to read, (3) Overnight camping stays shall be limited to 30 consecutive days with a maximum 30 days per year.	Primitive Camping	Modified definition for Primitive Camping to clarify RV usage parameters. These provisions were drafted to address nuisance situations. As such, the County's preference is to maintain a 10-day limit. The temporary nature of this use would allow it to occur more than once in a given year.
(j) Primitive Camping: Please see my previous comment referencing (4) I would replace (4) with: Recreational Vehicles may not be left on private property if there is not a permanent residential structure. This would help greatly!	Primitive Camping	Modified definition for Primitive Camping to clarify RV usage parameters. Suggestion for (4) does not fit with intent of these standards (since a permanent residential structure is required prior to overnight camping).
Primitive Camping, Accessory Uses and Structures. Suggestion I would suggest you leave out number (4). Most lots in Colorado City are NOT half an acre. You state in (1) Overnight camping shall be allowed on residential property with access to a private yard, then turn around in (4) and disallow their use on most lots in Colorado City. We've been allowing RV's to be on any lot in Colorado City for years as long as there is a residence. This is going to create considerable discontent	Primitive Camping	Removed half acre minimum

Pueblo County UDC - Consolidated Draft Comment Summary (September 2024)

<p>Is overnight camping allowed on our 40 acres? Not use as a commercial camping, just occasional overnight stays.</p>	<p>Proposed Zoning Map</p>	<p>NO CHANGE MADE Primitive camping permitted as an accessory use in all agricultural and residential zone districts.</p>
<p>This area should NOT be rezoned to allow for higher density housing. All surrounding properties are on an acre minimum, and are exclusively on septic. Homes built within the last few years did not have an option to be on sewer, so how do you think you will build higher density housing in this smaller area and have acceptable septic systems to support it? Congestion on Nichols is already high in the area due to the entrance to the reservoir. Adding higher density housing along that road will adversely impact the area with increased traffic. Additionally, water taps/water availability are already an issue for Pueblo West. It is irresponsible to rezone to increase density when water availability is already an issue. Not having a sign for rezoning posted in the area does not allow for the residents impacted to be able to reply. I only recently found out about this and feel that the county has not done it's due diligence to notify the surrounding properties of this proposed change.</p>	<p>Proposed Zoning Map</p>	<p>NO CHANGE MADE - Parcel ID #621000003 This area is designated as Neighborhood Mixed-Use in the Regional Comp. Plan, and the LR zone district is a lower-intensity district that implements the NMU land use category. Development in this area will remain limited by the lack of services (or, until services can be provided). Utility limitations were considered in the development of the Regional Comp. Plan (in collaboration with Pueblo West). Current zoning = R-3 Proposed zoning = LR, Mixed-Residential, Low Minor modifications to uses and density have been made (allowance of attached dwellings in addition to duplexes; decrease min. lot for duplex/attached from 70ft to 50ft; front and rear setback reduced by 5ft; increased lot coverage from 50 to 60%)</p>
<p>Dear Planning Commission, The property located at the pin above should not be rezoned or reclassified. This property is currently unincorporated county land. The area roadways surrounding this property are currently overburdened with traffic using Nichols Road and Mculloch Blvd to access the State Park and Reservoir. On Holiday Weekends traffic back up are outrageous on Nichols Road. Also this property currently is not connected to a sewer or potable water system due to it not being part of the Pueblo West Water District which therefore would require significant groundwater extraction via wells and septic discharge which would potentially have significant negative impacts to surrounding properties and the environment.</p>	<p>Proposed Zoning Map</p>	<p>See above</p>
<p>Amount of animals of one acre lot can have. Horses dogs cats exotic. Is this going to change? Businesses being run out of homes is this going to change? Who will enforce old/new rules. Will they be enforced or left like they are now?</p>	<p>Proposed Zoning Map</p>	<p>NO CHANGE MADE - Not a map-specific question, more specific to uses. Current zoning = A-3 Proposed zoning = RR, Rural Residential + PWO Properties with a minimum of one acre may keep horses, mules, goats, llamas, or alpacas, subject to applicable local and state regulations and the standards below. The keeping of cattle, swine, or sheep is not permitted. Home occupation is still permitted as an accessory use in agricultural and residential districts. The County's enforcement powers have not changed.</p>
<p>Add to PP</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Added PP as district that implements Commercial Mixed-Use (Comp Plan designation)</p>
<p>Add PP</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Added PP as district that implements Institutional Mixed-Use (Comp Plan designation)</p>
<p>Add PP</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Added PP as district that implements Light Industry (Comp Plan designation)</p>
<p>Add PP</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Added PP as district that implements Employment (Comp Plan designation)</p>
<p>If PP has unlimited building heights, these would not apply.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Removed standards for Energy Development Uses (subject to 1041); carry over from</p>

Pueblo County UDC - Consolidated Draft Comment Summary (September 2024)

If PP has no building setback requirements, these would not apply.	Pueblo Plex	Removed standards for Energy Development Uses (subject to 1041); carry over from
Same comment as 17.02.3	Pueblo Plex	Removed standards for Energy Development Uses (subject to 1041); carry over from
Request 'zero' building front setbacks.	Pueblo Plex	Removed standards for Energy Development Uses (subject to 1041); carry over from
60' building height may be too restrictive for some uses. Request unlimited, or increase to 120'.	Pueblo Plex	Removed standards for Energy Development Uses (subject to 1041)
Exempt PP from screening requirements between similar uses.	Pueblo Plex	Addressed through the integration of the existing Pueblo Plex standards; which had not been carried forward in the previous drafts.
Add 'P' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added hotel/motel as P
Add 'P/M' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added Med MJ, outdoor cultivation as P/M
Add 'P/M' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added Med MJ, products manufacturer as P/M
Add 'P/M' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added Med MJ, testing facility as P/M
Add 'P' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added Med MJ, transporter as P/M
Add 'P/M' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added Retail MJ, outdoor cultivation as P/M
Add 'P/M' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added Retail MJ, products manufacturer as P/M
Add 'P/M' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added Retail MJ, testing facility as P/M
Add 'P/M' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added Retail MJ, transporter as P/M
Add 'P' for PuebloPlex - stand-alone heliport already exists on site.	Pueblo Plex	Added private airport or heliport as S, consistent with other districts
Add 'P' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added car was as P
Add 'P' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added contractor's yard as P
Add 'P' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added hazardous storage as S, all hazardous uses on current list require BOCC approval
Add 'S' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added solid waste transfer station as P
Add 'P' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added indoor shooting range as S; consistent with other districts
Add 'P' for PuebloPlex - outdoor shooting range already exists at PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added outdoor shooting range as S; consistent with other districts
Add 'P' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added accessory greenhouse as P
Add 'P' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added accessory solar as P
Add 'P/D' for PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added utilities as P
Provide exemption for PuebloPlex to have stand-alone heliport - which already exists on site.	Pueblo Plex	No change necessary. Heliport already allowed.
Add PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added PP to list of districts in MJ use-specific standards
Add PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added PP to list of districts in MJ use-specific standards
Add PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Added PP to list of districts in contractor's yard use-specific standards
Add PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Language modified ot allow shipping containers as accesory use in all districts subject to use-specific standards
Please confirm that PuebloPlex is outside of the Floodplain Overlay (FPO) District. In the current zoning, the PuebloPlex property is noted as an 'Area Not Included'.	Pueblo Plex	Property may have been exempt from FEMA study, but not a UDC decision. Need to follow up with Public Works and/or FEMA
Add PuebloPlex	Pueblo Plex	Applicability expanded to all zone districts.
Please confirm that there are no paving and striping requirements for developments within the PuebloPlex zone district.	Pueblo Plex	Requirements apply countywide.
This does not seem possible. Even full cutoff fixtures would be visible at the property line and would still be compliant.	Pueblo Plex	No change. Requirements apply countywide.

**Pueblo County UDC - Consolidated Draft Comment Summary (September 2024)**

<p>Because of the uniqueness and size of the development, and the existing roadways, it is very likely that some lots will be double frontage for a single lot or parcel. Please exempt PuebloPlex from (c) (4).</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Added exemption as requested.</p>
<p>Pedestrian circulation on blocks exceeding 1,000 feet does not fit with the PuebloPlex industrial and manufacturing uses. Please exempt PuebloPlex from (d) (2)</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Modified for flexibility: "Pedestrian easement(s) of not less than eight feet in width with an improved pathway that is at least five feet wide shall be provided through blocks where blocks exceed 1,000 feet in length and pedestrian circulation is needed."</p>
<p>Please clarify the process for approvals by the Planning Director when calculating parking or loading spaces for multiple uses.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Added a Master Parking Plan process that could be applied to PuebloPlex or other "campus-type" situations.</p>
<p>Most of the current and proposed uses on the PuebloPlex property in Schedule A refer to recommended minimum requirements in Schedule B. However, Schedule B potentially results in excessive parking requirements for the scale and size of the existing uses at PuebloPlex (industrial, manufacturing, research, training, warehouse, etc.) Facilities at PuebloPlex would be better served by being subject to Schedule C (iv) based on full time employees (FTE) per main shift, number of seats/occupancy in training/meeting rooms, multiple uses, etc. This review could shift to the PuebloPlex Planning Director with the responsibility to provide necessary and reasonable standards with the PuebloPlex property. The PuebloPlex zone district should be defined in a way that avoids both (i) Administrative Parking Reduction and (ii) Special Use Permit for Parking Reduction.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Added a Master Parking Plan process that could be applied to PuebloPlex or other "campus-type" situations.</p>
<p>The PuebloPlex zone district should be defined in a way that avoids the (i) Administrative Parking Reduction and the (ii) Special Use Permit for Parking Reduction.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Added a Master Parking Plan process that could be applied to PuebloPlex or other "campus-type" situations.</p>
<p>Screening requirements were previously embedded with the P-1 Zone District and removed in the Draft PP PuebloPlex Zoning in Module 1. Because of the uniqueness, size and long-term development build-out of the PuebloPlex property, screening and buffering requirements were captured both in the Pueblo Regional Comprehensive Plan language and in the P-1 zone district to ensure incompatible uses internal to PuebloPlex are appropriately buffered from each other. There is nothing in the Screening Standards that addresses development compatibility within PuebloPlex. Please add the screening requirements back to the PuebloPlex zone district (Module 1), under a Standards section, like what has been done for additional standards in other zone districts.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Incorporated original PP screening standards as part of PP district that had not been carried forward in previous drafts.</p>
<p>Please confirm that there are no paving and striping requirements for developments within the PuebloPlex zone district.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Paving and striping are required per 17.04.020(g) Design and Location of Off-Street Parking</p>
<p>The bicycle parking requirement should not apply to the PuebloPlex zone district. The property is far removed from any urban area where employees would cycle to work, and the industrial and manufacturing uses will not generate public traffic that would be expected in commercial and retail areas.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Bike parking is not required in industrial districts. Added statement to clarify.</p>
<p>Please define 'major power transmission lines'. Undergrounding existing overhead lines will have tremendous cost implications at PuebloPlex. We would like to consider an exemption from the requirement to underground existing lines.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>Modified to acknowledge need for flexibility in rural areas of the county generally: "Where practical, all utilities, except major power transmission lines, shall be underground."</p>

**Pueblo County UDC - Consolidated Draft Comment Summary (September 2024)**

<p>Because PuebloPlex is a political subdivision of the State of Colorado, the subdivision of land will principally occur for industrial development, and PuebloPlex understands compliance with County infrastructure development standards is required. PuebloPlex requests that the requirement for a collateral deposit be waived for the subdivision of land at PuebloPlex.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>No change. If the County will end up owning and maintaining infrastructure, will need</p>
<p>Please define 'other agreements or contracts'</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>No change. Determined by BOCC and CAO, not specified in UDC.</p>
<p>If Pueblo County Public Works is permitting and inspecting all public improvements, why is it necessary to put an undue burden on the developer to have a full-time engineer on-site to be able to provide such a certification?</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>PuebloPlex would like to include an exception by itself without the limit of \$750.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>No change. Will be able to exempt if PP creates own fire district, goes toward fire hydrants. PP needs to have further discussion with Rural Fire (or applicable district), they can waive.</p>
<p>Needs to include PuebloPlex and reflect whatever fee PuebloPlex sets per lot, and under paragraph (iii) for how impact fees are to be paid. It is a possibility that PuebloPlex could have its own Fire Protection so it won't make sense to run these fees through the county.</p>	<p>Pueblo Plex</p>	<p>No change. Will be able to exempt if PP creates own fire district, goes toward fire hydrants. PP needs to have further discussion with Rural Fire (or applicable district), they can waive.</p>
<p>Please confirm whether a Fire Service Protection Plan may be submitted for phased development at PuebloPlex instead of submitting a Plan each time a parcel is subdivided.</p>	<p>PuebloPlex</p>	<p>No change. Clarified that that this is a requirement of the fire district and they will specify how to bring project forward.</p>
<p>Adding something to the affect, (d) Recreational Vehicle as Temporary Housing, Visitation. (1) Recreational vehicles/trailers cannot be used as a dwelling beside the principle dwelling for more than 30 days per year," This will allow grandpa and grandma and anyone else to visit for a set time without neighbors bothering them or those who have to enforce the codes. Bob Smith</p>	<p>Recreational Vehicle as Temporary Housing</p>	<p>These provisions were drafted to address nuisance situations. As such, the County's preference is to maintain a 10-day limit. The temporary nature of this use would allow it to occur more than once in a given year.</p>
<p>A composting facility, properly managed, is not a high-intensity use. Composting should be allowed adjacent to residential areas, assuming it complies with all existing city/county laws and does not disturb neighbors</p>	<p>Residential Adjacency Standards</p>	<p>This standard pertains to a commercial-scale compost facility. It does not apply to Small Scale Composting, which is defined as: An enclosed area not larger than 100 square feet in area that contains a compost tumbler or similar apparatus designed for the purpose of converting household kitchen and yard waste into fertilizer.</p>
<p>Again, what about existing? its is unreasonable to ask a farmer to lower the height of an already built structure because a developer got too close to the property line...</p>	<p>Residential Adjacency Standards</p>	<p>This standard does not apply to existing buildings.</p>
<p>Pallet fences are a great way to recycle, an adorable decoration option, and a low-cost construction method that is accessible to low income residents. Banning them is inconsistent with historical usage, and forces an unnecessarily high cost burden to low income east side residents who will be suddenly forced to upgrade existing fencing due to a revised code.</p>	<p>Screening</p>	<p>Clarified language to address use of scrap materials in their original form. The UDC supports County residents continued ability to use property and structures the way they are currently being used. Enforcement is not automatic. The intent is to allow the County the ability to enforce code when needed.</p>



**Pueblo County UDC - Consolidated Draft Comment Summary (September 2024)**

<p>limiting where shipping containers may be used as accessory structures in the A1, A2, A3, CC, LI, and HI zone districts. We already have many shipping containers in residential areas of Colorado City and other areas of Pueblo county because they are a relative recent issue &amp; the county had no guidance. You're going to end up with more complaints than you can imagine. Are we to now tell these owners they must remove the container? If they are grandfathered in, the uproar from people who want to put them in is going to be overwhelming. Please readdress this issue and include residential areas also. Below is what I put together earlier for we were needing written guidance from the county.</p> <p>Container Type Accessory Building Regulations</p> <p>THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED as of 04-30-2023, by the Colorado City Architectural Advisory Committee (CCAAC) as follows:</p> <p>Definition: A conex, conex box, conex container, shipping container, transport container, portable site storage container or other such containers regardless of name that were originally designed for or capable of being mounted or moved by rail, truck or ship by means of being mounted on a chassis or similar transport device. Hereafter will be referred to as "containers".</p> <p>1. Containers will not be utilized as a 'container home'.</p> <p>2. The placement of containers shall only be allowed under the following circumstances.</p>	<p>Shipping Containers</p>	<p>Expanded allowances for shipping containers to all districts, subject to use-specific standards.</p>
<p>Sign updates as recommended by the sign industry: Allow neon signs for Marijuana Uses Electronic Message Display (EMD) brightness should be set as percentage of maximum: 75% day 50% nighttime Allow animation but not video Remove 3 second hold time Require large EMD signs to be incorporated in a static sign to avoid large electronic billboard effect</p>	<p>Signs</p>	<p>Recommended changes have been incorporated.</p>
<p>Currently, Puebloans are allowed to keep up to 10 adult poultry at their homes. There are essentially no properties within Pueblo that are 2+ acres. Please carve out an exception for small flocks which can be kept on urban properties, so that Puebloans can maintain food security and keep their animals.</p>	<p>Urban Agriculture</p>	<p>The proposed UDC applies to unincorporated areas of Pueblo County, not the City of Pueblo. Pueblo County does not have a limit currently, though Pueblo West has poultry regulations. The size threshold for Poultry Keeping and Aviaries was removed, along with specifications on the numbers of birds that may be kept (for Urban Agriculture).</p>

Pueblo County UDC - Consolidated Draft Comment Summary (September 2024)

<p>Allowing only female chickens in an agricultural community like Pueblo County is inconsistent with historical use patterns. Enforcing will cause disruptions to residents' businesses and cultural practices. Residents who have laying flocks of non-chicken fowl will have decreased household food security.</p> <p>At the very least, to protect food security and local farms, include all commonly kept domestic poultry: chickens, ducks, Muscovy ducks, geese, turkey, quail, and guinea fowl.</p>	Urban Agriculture	Prohibition on roosters has been removed from the RR zone district. Poultry definition added to encompass ducks, etc.
<p>This seems like a bad idea to me. When I was shopping for my home I checked out houses in a bunch of different neighborhoods and one reason I settled on the East side is because I heard a neighbor's rooster, and I knew it would mean that this is the kind of neighborhood where people may be less well off, but they'd take care of each other. And it's proven true: I know that people around here don't just supplement their own food with chickens and ducks and such, they help their less fortunate neighbors out directly, giving away eggs at the farmer's market and entire birds at the food pantry at Christmastime. Don't be a Scrooge - let people keep their ducks and geese and roosters. Let the East side keep its character. Please and thank you, Thomas Eliot</p>	Urban Agriculture	The proposed UDC applies to unincorporated areas of Pueblo County, not the City of Pueblo. Prohibition on roosters has been removed from the RR zone district. Poultry definition added to encompass ducks, etc.
<p>This will have negative impacts on household food security for families and neighborhoods who supplement their diets with eggs and meat from backyard fowl. I also suggest allowing other types of backyard fowl such as ducks, geese, turkey, quail, and guinea fowl, to protect small farmers' businesses and allow for more diverse and nutritious local food choices.</p>	Urban Agriculture	Prohibition on roosters has been removed from the RR zone district. Poultry definition added to encompass ducks, etc.
<p>What kind of screening would be suitable... seems somewhat unreasonable to have to "hide" storage buildings</p>	Use-Specific Standards (Agricultural Uses)	Removed screening requirement.
<p>Please remember water is a finite resource!!</p>	Water	General comment. No change required.
<p>This size limitation is short sighted and does not allow for the newest technologies which do not require large blades to generate wind technology. Consider providing flexibility for development of newer better technologies.</p>	Wind Energy	