

City of Colorado Springs Infill and Redevelopment Action Plan 12-17-15 Version

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
1.A.1	Neighborhood Process	Create and endorse a replicable process and template for strategic small area and neighborhood plans	New, updated and enhanced neighborhood plans are necessary to allow infill to occur in a manner that is supportive of and reasonably supported by neighborhoods. Plans are out-of-date or missing. A replicable template would optimize use of City resources and the value of these plans.	Short Term	City Comprehensive Planning Division (CPD), in coordination with CONO and other stakeholders; Significant IT-GIS role	Staff; stakeholders including the development community; Informal PC and Informal Council for formal adoption; The process for developing the templates should be similar to that used to develop the form-based code	Resources available for first phase with limited augmentation; Would need to be high priority for Comprehensive Planning Division; part of this could be a good job for an intern or temp. staff assignment	1) Template created and endorsed; 2) Successfully piloted; 3) Effectively used	Concept being discussed informally; not formally initiated	Neighborhood/ area delineation will be a key step in this process. Neighborhood have collective common features and typically have multiple uses. It will be critical to address Infill Plan goals including accessible and walkable design
1.A.2	Neighborhood Process	Pilot process and template on first neighborhood plan	see above.	Medium Term	CPD, CONO and area/neighborhood leadership; other stakeholders; multiple departments will also have a role	Staff; community stakeholders including any affected HOAs or property owners associations, or CONO in the absence of these; and PC and Council for formal adoption	Resources not fully available at this time; Would need to be high priority for Comprehensive Planning Division	Pilot completed in 9 months	Not yet initiated	Pilot area to be carefully selected with stakeholders, and should have infill issues and opportunities.
1.A.3	Neighborhood Process	Roll out refined process to complete plans for remaining high priority neighborhoods	see above.	Medium to Long Term	CPD, CONO and area/neighborhood leadership; other stakeholders; multiple departments will also have a role	Staff; community stakeholders including CONO; PC and Council; including budget priorities	TBD; substantial, and resources not identified and available this time; could involve contracted staff and/or consultants	Plans initiated/completed in identified period as compared with total priority areas; Cost per plan in time and dollars; Qualitative and quantitative measures of value of plans	Not yet initiated	Note: Particularly for this action and for 1.A.2 above, there will be a relationship to the 2016-2017 Comprehensive Plan update process
1.B.1	Neighborhood Process	Revise appeals section of the Code (7.5.906) to more clearly limit the standing of parties who can appeal and the basis for appeals	As currently written the land use appeals section of the Code allows "any aggrieved person" to appeal almost any administrative or hearing-based decision for reasons that maybe tied to fairly open-ended criteria. For property owners and developers, this creates an extra measure of uncertainty and potential delay. "Tightening up" the appeals process could preserve the appeal rights and options of the most impacted parties, while at the same time reducing the potential for the appeals process to result in delay in getting to final decisions.	Short Term	LUR; Code Scrub Committee	Staff drafted; Code Scrub Committee review; PC; Council; key role for City Attorney's Office (high level of outreach anticipated)	Limited direct; primarily time of existing staff and stakeholders, plus hearing processes	1) Completion of hearing process by Q2- 2016; 2) Subsequent staff and stakeholder input on impact 3) Subsequent data on number of appeals	Code Scrub Committee Process to occur in late 2015	Establish standing for appeal in the code. Limit appeal only to challenged approval criteria.
2.A.1	Zoning	Update existing Downtown FBZ Code-Phase 1	The Downtown FBZ is an important zoning tool used to support the continuing development and redevelopment of the Downtown as a cornerstone of the City's infill vision and strategy. Periodic reviews and updates are needed to maintain its maximum value and effectiveness	Short Term	LUR; Code Scrub Committee; Downtown Design Review Board (DRB)	Staff drafted; Imagine Downtown Plan (IDP) consultant; Code Scrub Committee review; DRB; Council	Limited direct; primarily time of existing staff and stakeholders, plus hearing processes	1) Completion of hearing process on initial changes in 2016; 2) Subsequent staff and stakeholder input on impact from changes	Some topic identified; otherwise not initiated	Address current outstanding issues with current FBZ (other than major changes regarding signage) including setbacks/utilities nexus; parking and other changes recommended by IDP consultant

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
2.A.2	Zoning	Revise existing Downtown FBZ Code-Phase 2- Signage	The Downtown FBZ largely defers to the City-wide sign code which is not always applicable or preferable, in turn leading to requests for warrants (waivers) from the Code. A Downtown-specific sign code would address this need.	Medium Term	LUR; Development Review Enterprise (DRE) Code Scrub Committee; DRB; City Sign specialist	Staff drafted; Code Scrub Committee review; DRB; Council	Limited direct; but will involve considerable time of existing staff and stakeholders, plus hearing processes; possible use of a consultant or contract staff	1) Completion of hearing process by 2017; 2) Subsequent staff and stakeholder input on impact from changes	Not initiated	Completion of Downtown-specific sign code in addition to any other changes deemed necessary at this time
2.A.3	Zoning	Extend Downtown FBZ into appropriate applicable areas	There are areas adjacent to but not now located in the Downtown FBZ, that are or may be priorities for infill development and might benefit from an FBZ approach. This option is available on a case-by-case basis, and could provide an opportunity to take advantage of the existing Downtown FBZ for these logical areas. However, work would need to be done in order create new or modified "sector" standards for these new areas	TBD	LUR; Downtown Partnership	Staff or Downtown Partnership-initiated; PC; Council; substantial stakeholder process including neighborhood groups and directly impacted property owners	Some of the required planning costs may be encompassed by the IDP update process; however funding may be needed to prepare a plan for South Nevada area if considered; Costs of updating regulating plan and processing the amendment would need to be addressed	Completion of recommended inclusions by 2017	Imagine Downtown Plan update underway- otherwise not initiated (10/15)	IDP consultant process should be reasonably completed before formally initiating inclusions of new property
2.A.4	Zoning	Prepare and adopt new FBZ plans	Although the Infill chapter of the Comprehensive Plan does not recommend a large-scale City-wide conversion to FBZ zoning, certain infill and redevelopment areas could benefit. Creation of FBZ plans is process and labor intensive and requires broad-based community input. Therefore, there should be a City role in this process	TBD	CPD; LUR	Staff, develop or community-initiated; PC; Council; substantial stakeholder process including neighborhood groups and directly impacted property owners	Substantial costs to create new vision plan if needed and to create new regulating plan (possibly \$30,000 for public regulating plan); plus staff, stakeholder and hearing time	TBD	Not initiated; TBD	Costs and process for development-specific FBZ plans could be borne partly by developer, but must be led by the City in most cases. Likely public candidate areas might be South and North Nevada
2.B.1	Zoning	Add "Uses by Right" (permitted uses) in non-residential or non- single-family districts	If infill supporting uses are not allowed as a permitted use in a particular zone district, the property owner's options include applying for a rezoning, applying for a conditional use (if allowable in that district) or applying for a variance of use. All of these processes have some costs, take time and can have uncertainty risk. For the range of zone districts between public facilities and single family districts on one side of the spectrum and heavier industrial districts on other, there may be potential for adding some permitted uses to this "mixed use middle". A tradeoff may entail the adoption of some additional standards to address the impacts of any added uses.	Short to Medium Term	LUR	Staff-initiated; Code Scrub Committee reviewed; PC; Council: additional stakeholder outreach including CONO and development community	Limited direct; primarily time of existing staff and stakeholders, plus hearing processes	Adoption of recommended Code changes by 2016	Not initiated	Some uses may need 'performance standards' to ensure compatibility.

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
2.B.2	Zoning	Implement City-Initiated TOD-supportive zoning overlays for priority corridors and activity centers	A primary recommendation of the Infill Chapter is to encourage transit-compatible development and redevelopment in association with frequent transit corridors. Overlay zoning provides one important tool with which to support this recommendation.	Medium to Long Term	CPD; Transit Services; LUR	Staff-initiated but highly stakeholder based; Code Scrub Committee reviewed; PC; Council ; additional stakeholder outreach including impacted property owners, CONO and development community.	TBD, but significant in terms of staff and potentially consultant time. Significant analysis and notice costs and efforts	TBD	Not initiated	Contingent on finalizing corridors and areas; "Vision-level " plans should adopted for corridors such as North and South Nevada. May be some hesitancy to implement prior to Comp. Plan Update. May also be a bias against required density. Standards should address accessibility and be inclusive
2.B.3	Zoning	Revise the Findings in Section 7.5.603.B of the Zoning Code and the purpose statements in Section 7.3.101.A and 7.3.201.A to be more directly supportive of infill and redevelopment	From a zoning-related perspective, the successful implementation of desirable infill and redevelopment will be dependent not only on development in exist zoning districts or City-initiated changes to zoning, but also on privately initiated requests for different zoning.	Short Term	CPD, LUR	Staff-initiated but highly stakeholder based; Code Scrub Committee reviewed; PC; Council ; additional stakeholder outreach including impacted property owners, CONO and development community.	Limited direct; primarily time of existing staff and stakeholders, plus hearing processes	1) Code change implemented; 2) Qualitative feedback	Not initiated	Very limited (but carefully considered) wording would be all that is necessary. Most important could be adding a just a few words to the standard findings, highlighting the importance of infill, as applicable
2.B.4	Zoning	Revise development plan review criteria in Section 7.5.502 of the Zoning Code	The City's development review criteria are used in conjunction with the review of normally administrative development plans throughout the City including in infill areas. The "open ended" nature of the current criteria allow them to potentially be used to discourage almost any combination of use, bulk and density.	Short Term	Planning	Staff-initiated; Code Scrub Committee reviewed; PC; Council; additional stakeholder outreach including, CONO and development community (HBA)	Limited direct; primarily time of existing staff and stakeholders, plus hearing processes	1) Code change implemented; 2) Qualitative feedback	Initial research and first draft completed by staff (10/15)	
2.B.5	Zoning	Specifically amend Chapter 7.4.201-207 of the Zoning Code (Off Street Parking Requirements) to adopt new infill-supportive standards including allowing credit for on-street and off-site parking in some cases	Outside of the parking-exempt area of Downtown, it is not uncommon for infill projects to have difficulty meeting current parking requirements within their sites and based on a strict application of calculations and standards in the Zoning Code. Credit for on-street, shared or off-site parking is not normally allowed, even if reasonably available. Options for alternative compliance are (e.g. credit for alternative modes, unique use mixes etc.) are also limited.	Short Term	LUR; Fire Department	Staff-initiated; Code Scrub Committee reviewed; PC; Council; additional stakeholder outreach including, CONO and development community (HBA)	Limited direct; primarily time of existing staff and stakeholders, plus hearing processes	1)Code changes adopted; 2) Number of development approvals with shared parking	Not initiated	Include backing out in to alley ROW for non-res uses. Review parking standards in general particularly within FBZ and TOD areas to have a maximum allowed as surface spaces; Consider strategic versus across-the-board reductions based on context

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
2.B.6	Zoning	Evaluate and implement options to allow more accommodation of Accessory Dwelling Units in single-family areas	Generally, ADUs are small fully independent housing units associated with existing 1sf dwelling units (e.g. small apartments within home, small cottages or units over garages. Although ADUs may be effectively precluded in many neighborhoods due to covenants, in others, particularly in mature areas, they could provide an opportunity for reinvestment, use of existing capacity and housing options, without significantly altering their character. The addition of ADUs could also the unique housing needs of demographic group[s] including seniors and millennials	Medium Term	CPD/LUR	Staff-initiated; Code Scrub Committee reviewed; PC; Council; additional stakeholder outreach including CONO and development community (HBA)	Substantial costs associated with the analysis and process	1) Substantive Code changed adopted, 3) New ADUs registered etc.	Not initiated	approach most likely should be area neighborhood-specific rather than across an entire zone district; should also evaluate lot sizes, impact of CCRs etc.
2.B.7	Zoning	For mature areas, establish or amend geographically specific development standards based on neighborhood plans and input. Also establish clear criteria for administrative relief from these standards.	This is general recommendation- much of which might be best addressed in conjunction with overall updates of the Zoning Code and Traffic Criteria Manual (Part III of the Engineering Criteria Manual)- see also 6.A.3 below	Medium to Long Term	LUR; Code Scrub Committee	Staff drafted; Code Scrub Committee review; PC; Council;	Limited direct; primarily time of existing staff and stakeholders, plus hearing processes	1) Completion of hearing process on initial changes 2) Subsequent staff and stakeholder input on impact	Not initiated	Separate meetings with CONO/HBA likely
3.A.1	Utilities	Increase open access to CSU facilities and capacity information	As with other areas of the City, much of the "due diligence" associated with land development decisions can occur offline and prior to formal meetings or applications, if the data are available. For infill projects, being able to find out about the location, type, condition and probable capacity of utilities (along with their associated easements) can be particularly important. Much of this data is currently in digital form but not available to outside users.	Short to Long Term	CSU, El Paso County	Potentially coordinated between CSU and RBA; Some data comes from other entities such as El Paso County	TBD but CSU; design and roll out costs could be substantial; some potential for lost revenue from data sales	1) Decision on policy; design and structure; 2) Roll out of product; 3) Quantitative and qualitative measures of use and value	Options and recommendations being actively evaluated by UPAC as of December 2016	Recommended approach to be finalized by UPAC in Q1 2016 and then potentially carried forward to UB and Council; there are limits to this data (e.g. capacity might be there but not condition etc.) There are also system security issues that must be addressed
3.A.2	Utilities	Align CSU capital improvement plans to strategically upgrade systems in high priority infill areas including Downtown	Downtown is an identified cornerstone for the City's infill vision. There are a variety of Utilities-related challenges associated with Downtown including capacity and aging sometimes poorly located systems	Medium to Long Term	CSU; UB	CSU, UPAC, UB, Council	Variable and case-by-case determination	1) Report on needs, funded projects and priorities; 2) Implementation of highest priority projects	Being addressed by CSU: however UPAC has suggested revisions to this recommendation	To be reviewed case-by-case by CSU Development Review Team
3.A.3	Utilities	Develop and implement utilities standards for mature areas that minimize or optimize requirements to upgrade or replace existing infrastructure and which are sensitive to existing conditions and constraints	Meeting full "suburban" or "new area" CSU standards can be difficult in infill areas, particularly with respect to the age, condition, complexity and spacing limitations associated with existing facilities and available space. Reasonable openness to options including alternate standards can make an important impact on the practical and financial feasibility of infill projects, In infill areas, even a fairly small project can trigger the need for significant adjacent or off-site upgrades.	Ongoing	CSU	CSU, UPAC, UB, Council	Variable and case-by-case determination	Case-by-case feedback	Being addressed by CSU: however UPAC has suggested revisions to this recommendation	

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
3.A.4	Utilities	Refine System Development Charges to support and encourage infill	CSU System Development Charges (SDCs) or water and sewer taps constitute a significant cost for new development, and sometimes for intensified redevelopment. Although CSU already has a system of SDCs that distinguishes by lot area for single-family meters and further distinguishes somewhat for multifamily units, some additional "granularity" could provide benefit for infill projects with particularly low water and wastewater usage (due to very low unit size etc.)	Medium Term	CSU?	CSU staff; UPAC; UB; Council	TBD; one-time and ongoing; assume limited and largely net-budget-neutral changes	Adoption of revised table of charges supportive of infill (or an complete an informed and full process recommending no changes)	UPAC to discuss in January 2016; May be part of final UPAC recommendations to UB/Council	
3.A.5	Utilities	Implement limited option to transfer meter credits for infill-supportive purposes	This recommendation is already moving forward as late 2015. It could generally benefit infill if the program is limited to transfers into or within infill areas.	Short Term	CSU	CSU staff; stakeholders; UB; Council; Required changes to Utility Rules and Regulations (URRs) and City Code	TBD; cost of process plus limited forgone revenues (possibly augmented by induced demand)	1) Phase 1 change implemented; 2) potential further changes implemented	Limited transfer option included in 2016 CSU rate case; expected to be approved in late 2015; additional options pending	
3.A.6	Utilities	Further revise inactive meter policies, fees and rules to support infill	This recommendation is also already moving forward as late 2015, which could result in removal of these fees. This should benefit infill at applicable locations because most inactive meters tend to be associated with older or disinvested areas	Short Term	CSU	CSU, UPAC, UB, Council	TBD; cost of process plus limited forgone revenues (possibly augmented by included demand)	Adoption of a revised policy and URRs	Abbreviated CSU rate case in process; could be approved by early 2016	
3.A.7	Utilities	Actively continue to use strategic teams to address priority infill areas and issues	When utilities related infill challenges are only addressed as they come up in association with individual projects, the process can be inefficient in terms of time, cost and frustration for all parties. Strategic teams can more proactively address challenges that come up regularly, identifying better solutions in some cases, and at least better communicating the unavoidable constraints in others. An example is the team currently addressing Downtown utilities topics.	Ongoing	CSU?	CSU staff; stakeholders	TBD; dependent on staffing allocation	Periodic reports on team(s) status; progress and results	Standing team is now available for Downtown and can be engaged for any project; Established Development Review Team in 2015	
4.A.1	Private Property Care and Maintenance	Champion and support proactive Code Enforcement including both enhanced outreach and prevention programs and effective enforcement	Proactive "full spectrum" code enforcement is identified as important supporting element of an infill strategy, particularly for disinvested areas. Property owners and developers are less likely to reinvest in areas and neighborhoods unless a minimum standard of private property care can be assured via a combination of community support and enforcement of the most egregious cases	Ongoing	Mayor's Office; Council; Planning	All applicable City staff; City Communications	TBD; Limited direct costs; possible additional marketing and communications costs; possible costs of additional resources for either staff or programs; possible direct and indirect offsets from greater compliance	1) Positive media coverage; 2) community feedback; 3) announcements of new initiatives and reports on experience	Organizational shift to Planning & Development Department completed; other steps could occur; limited resources in 2016 budget	
4.A.1	Private Property Care and Maintenance	Revise codes and processes to enhance effectiveness of Code Enforcement	Although the large majority of all Code Enforcement cases are abated without the need for a protracted process, there can be a frustration with the time it takes for the process to result in effective abatement for some persistent or egregious cases. In particular, liens on properties (versus property owners) can be ineffective	Medium Term	Planning/Code Enforcement, with Attorney	Options generated by staff with Attorney; stakeholder input including CONO, business community and Apartment Association, City Council	Primarily staff and stakeholder time and cost . However options for more proactive enforcement may involve added legal costs, and more aggressive City abatement would require up-front financial resources	1) Code and process changes implemented, 2) Increased "effective clearance rate" for the most serious cases	Not initiated	

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
4.B.1	Public Property Care and Maintenance?	Maintain existing infrastructure in the most cost-effective manner in order to support infill	Sustainable maintenance of public infrastructure such as roads, sidewalks, streetscapes, trails, parks, and schools (in their case by school districts) is an important aspect of infill support because these systems function as both the skeleton and the front door. Mature areas are more likely to have higher proportions of facilities in poor condition and less likely to have mechanisms such as districts and property owners associations in place to upgrade maintain them.	Ongoing, including but not limited to 2016 proposed ballot initiative	Citywide (primarily Public Works, Parks and CSU)	Multiple strategies	Very substantial, but with potential for induced revenues and offsets	Multiple measures mostly tied to asset management systems	Update after 11/15 ballot issue	
4.B.2	Public Property Care and Maintenance	Enable and promote full-service streetscape adoption	High quality (but not "one size fits all") sustainable streetscapes are an essential part of the fabric of the community needed to support continuing reinvestment. Major corridors and community/neighborhood entrances are of particular importance. General City revenues are inadequate and special financing entities (such as the DDA, districts and associations) are not always viable options. Current adoption programs, while valuable, tend to focus on limited ongoing care and not on new investments and capitalized maintenance. Therefore new funding opportunities may need to be developed.	TBD	Parks?	Parks, Public Works, City Attorney's Office	Cost of staff time; potential for offset of City costs	1) Determination of preference and feasibility; 2) Potential policies programs and procedures in place; 3) If applicable, streetscape miles and/or value of improvements sponsored	Not initiated	May be some complications with liability
4.B.3	Public Property Care and Maintenance	Fully integrate streetscape characteristics and maintenance information in City asset management system	The full spectrum of streetscape quality and maintenance important to infill success, especially for key corridors. This this is more than the quality of asphalt and concrete and the presence or absence of sidewalks. It also involves keeping track of the type and quality of streetscapes (including elements of Urban Forestry) and spatially understanding all the various entities (besides the City and the immediate property owner) that have a role in taking care of them. Having more of this information in an integrated system will allow a better understanding of gaps, needs and the best choices for priorities and strategies.	TBD, Medium Term+	TBD?	Staff level	Significant, cross departmental and TBD; some ongoing system maintenance cost	Proportion of City included in asset management system by feature	Asset management framework in place, but not fully initiated.	Need to confer with Parks and Public Works; this was recommendation of the Streetscape Solutions Team also
5.A.1	Parks and Cultural Services	Comprehensively address infill and redevelopment issues and needs in conjunction with an overall Park Lands Dedication Ordinance (PLDO) update, including consideration of park development and renovation fees as options	The current PLDO is primarily structured around providing new park land (or paying fees in lieu of parkland) for newly developing areas. Requirements are limited to residential subdivisions, and there are strict limits on the use of the fee revenue. This system is not always amendable to infill areas where the parks-related needs do not match the limits in the ordinance. The needs in infill areas often have less to do with acquiring more land and more to do with either reinvestment in existing facilities or provision of non-traditional and non-qualifying improvements,	TBD with Parks Dept. and Mayor's Office	Parks Department, Planning, Real Estate Services: likely committee or task force	Staff/committee process; Parks Board; PC; Council	Staff-related cost of the process; ultimate likelihood of increased fee revenues but also different allocation impacts	1) Process, structure and staff/committee charge completed; 2) Changes adopted	Recommended in recently adopted Parks Master Plan but not initiated	Elimination of any fees or requirements for infill areas would create the greatest incentive; However, this might not address the need or result in the desirable public amenities
5.A.2	Parks and Cultural Services	Extend land dedication and/or park development fees to include non-residential properties	This recommendation is also an extension of 5.A.1 above, and has City-wide implications. Additional non-residential development creates site-related demands for parks-related facilities, but not the same as with more traditional residential development.	TBD with Parks Dept. and Mayor's Office	Parks Department, Planning, likely committee or task force	Staff/committee process; Parks Board; Council	Staff-related cost of the process; ultimate likelihood of increased fee revenues	1) Process, structure and staff/committee charge completed; 2) Changes adopted	Not initiated	New fees could result in a barrier to reinvestment, especially unless there was flexibility in allowing credit public realm investments

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
6.A.1	Transportation	Prepare and adopt new Engineering Criteria Manual standards allowing for the elimination or reduction of requirements for formal TISs (Traffic Impact Studies) for most infill projects.	Traditional TISs focus on projecting the motorized traffic demand created by a project, projecting its distribution on the existing roadway network, evaluating the level of service (LOS) impacts to those facilities, including intersections, and then recommending improvements such as added lanes and signals to maintain a desired LOS. These studies are expensive to prepare. For some infill projects the results will be fairly well known and understood without the analysis being done. Moreover, if the philosophy for some infill areas and corridors is to accept more congestion (and expect transportation behaviors and multi-modal systems to adapt) these studies have limited positive application. For projects where the traffic impacts will clearly remain below traditionally accepted LOSs, the results can end up primarily being used as an argument against more traffic rather than one pertaining to capacity.	Ongoing and Continuing	Public Works, Traffic Engineering Section	Public Works and Planning; largely related to the development review and public hearing processes	No direct City costs; potential for case-by-case long term costs and benefits	Large infill projects with requirement waived	Ongoing to some extent with waivers, but Engineering Criteria Manual amendments not yet initiated	process cost savings to applicable developers; savings can be more than just the cost of the report
6.A.2	Transportation	Develop, adapt and adopt transportation facility, access and related standards specific to infill areas by amending Section 3 of the Engineering Criteria Manual (Traffic Criteria Manual). Address multimodal factors, as applicable including transit, bicycles, pedestrian movements off-site parking. Adopt clear criteria of waivers.	Although it allows for substantial flexibility in some cases, the City's ECM, including its Traffic Criteria Manual, have a suburban and greenfield development orientation, that make it difficult to accommodate infill conditions and values. Although waivers of these standards are a reasonable and appropriate option in some cases, the associated uncertainty and subjective can be a challenge. Improved alignment of these Manuals with infill conditions and values will reduce uncertainty risk generally encourage reinvestment. TIS requirements also do not address certain modes such as transit and bicycles	Medium to Long Term	Planning and Public Works	Staff-generated (Planning/Public Works); CSC input and review; PC; possible DRB; City Council	Staff and processing time TBD	1) Systematic Code and manual review completed; 2) Amendments approved	Not initiated	
6.A.3	Transportation	Strategically involve the Parking Enterprise as a tool for redevelopment, including leveraging its potential for public/private partnerships	Continued development and redevelopment of Downtown is an identified cornerstone of the City's infill plan and strategy. Structured and on-street spaces controlled by the Parking Enterprise account for a significant share of the parking demand associated with Downtown land uses. As such the role of the Enterprise will be critical to Downtown's continuing development including the ongoing alignment of capital programs moving forward with options to support Downtown residential development.	TBD and Ongoing	Parking Enterprise	Parking Enterprise; Planning; Economic Vitality; Downtown Partnership; stakeholders; Council	TBD; financial implications for Parking Enterprise	TBD	Ongoing to some extent (e.g. with Olympic Museum; however a comprehensive evaluation of the Enterprise's role has not been done	various options including coordination and partnering on location and timing of facilities, parking fee in lieu of providing parking; allocation of parking garage spaces a cost
6.B.1	Transportation	Focus infill strategies to support designated high frequency transit corridors (see also 2.B.2)	A primary recommendation and focus of the Infill Chapter centers on the importance of evolving the land uses along designated high frequency transit corridors to both take advantage of this transit capacity and create the land use conditions necessary to result in demand for a more robust transit system. The zoning options in 2.B.2 represent one of these strategies, but others potentially include alignment of resources including planning, transit improvements an street improvements.	Ongoing	Transit and Planning	Multiple strategies	Varies by strategy	1) Infill activity in priority areas; 2) Transit investments, service, demand and productivity in corridors	Status varies by initiative and to some extent- ongoing	Density must be part of this conversation in order for success.

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
7.A.1	Priority Area Plans and Strategies	Create and adopt the new or revised vision, land use and/or transportation/ facility plans necessary to support the redevelopment of priority infill areas including Downtown and mature arterial corridors	Priority areas need adopted, up-to-date and community-reflective land use and transportation plans in order to have a vision to focus on and framework to build toward. Desired and acceptable land uses need to be understood and identified, and multi-modal street and public area plans need to be in place. For some areas such as Downtown overall plans are in place strategic updates are needed. For others such as South Nevada Avenue, there are limited current land use, transportation or parks and open space plans to work from. For still others such as North Nevada Avenue, the existing roadway plan requires updating, and not land use plan exists. Needs for land use, vision and facility plans vary for different priority areas.	Short to Long Term	Planning	Staff, stakeholders including neighborhoods and impacted property owners, consultants and URA as applicable, PC, Council	City budgetary requirements are considerable and will be dependent whether the plans will be created in-house or with the services of a consultant. However, there is always a considerable need for staff time and resources. Per plan costs of \$50,000-100,000 provides a rough rule of thumb	1) Funding and successful adoption of plans; 2) Ultimate demonstrated implementation of plans	Imagine Downtown Plan update funded (by the DDA) and actively underway as of late 2015; Some impetus is occurring with the North Nevada land use planning efforts. Funding has been secured for an amendment of the North Nevada roadway plans. A consultant has been chosen for the Downtown transit terminal study. Funding not identified for a number of other key plans or updates	
7.A.2	Priority Area Plans and Strategies	Proactively develop and adopt zoning and design standards for priority infill areas (see also 2.B.2)	The need for revised or additional zoning standards has been identified for several priority infill, particularly associated with older arterial corridors such as North and South Nevada Avenue.	Medium to Long Term	Planning	Staff, stakeholders including impacted property owners, PC, Council	City budgetary requirements can be significant depending on the nature and extent of the zone changes and will be dependent whether the plans will be created in-house or with the services of a consultant.	1) Adoption of new or revised standards and regulations; 2) Demonstrated success in use of the standards and regulations.	No major initiatives underway at this time	Includes standards for accessibility and pedestrian orientation
7.A.3	Priority Area Plans and Strategies	Secure funding for and implement highest priority public improvements in priority infill areas, including transportation projects (see also 8.A.1)	For many infill and redevelopment projects to be able to economically move forward, it is not enough to have the land use and transportation plans and requirements in place (e.g., having street cross sections, access plans and streetscape plans in place). Public or quasi public funding needs to be identified, and then programmed and spent for at least a part of the required infrastructure	Medium to Long Term	Public Works with Planning	Varies by source of funds but often involves staff of various departments, stakeholders, possibly special districts CTAB, PPACG, PPRTA and Council	These are typically high dollar budget items, needing to be prioritized from among scarce resources, and typically requiring a lot of lead time	1) Development of clear but adaptable lists of strategic priority projects for funding; 2) evidenced of funding identified and secured; 3) projects implemented	Status varies by priority area and project; an area-specific set of priorities and schedules will need to be maintained	
7.A.4	Priority Area Plans Strategies	Actively identify, support and demonstrate progress on catalyst projects in infill priority areas	Public, private or combined public/ private catalyst projects can be very important to "kick start" or lay the groundwork for additional investment and redevelopment in infill areas. These may be "first in" public or private development projects or completion of key infrastructure. Some catalyst projects can particularly important in acting as geographic cornerstones (e.g. the Downtown multimodal transit terminal). For large areas such as the South Academy corridor, catalyst project and area designations provide manageable places to focus and start.	Short to Long Term	Varies dependent on projects. For private or non-profit projects the City "lead" may function in a supporting role	Varies by project	Varies by project but typically very substantial on the parts of the City, another public agency, a non-profit or a private developer.	1) Progress and success associated with identified catalyst projects; Evidenced induced or related impacts of the projects	Status varies by priority area and project; and area-specific set of identified catalyst projects should be created and maintained in order to track progress	
7.A.5	Priority Area Plans and Strategies	Strategically designate urban renewal areas for priority infill areas (see also 8.A.3)	Decisions regarding use of urban renewal authority will be important for a number of infill areas and projects. For example the current initiative to designate part of the South Nevada area will likely have a major impact on the rate and success of redevelopment in that area	Short to Long Term	Planning with URA	Staff, stakeholders including property owners and neighbors, URA, PC, Council	City direct budget implications may be small unless there was shift to advancing City funds for urban renewal area plans and studies etc.	1) progress on URA designations, plans and financing; 2) ultimate success of redevelopment in and around urban renewal areas	Gold Hill Mesa urban renewal areas bifurcated in 2015, to maximize their utility. South Nevada urban renewal area in final stages of designation in late 2015.	

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
7.A.6	Priority Area Plans and Strategies	Coordinate with regional partners (such as PPACG and PPRBD) to secure and leverage resources to support infill priority areas and projects	Partnerships with outside agencies will be critical in achieving infill success, especially in securing resources and in aligning plans and programs. PPACG is especially important due to its role in the allocation of resources for multimodal transportation projects. However, there are several other key partners including PPRTA, the County, colleges and universities, the military and school districts	Short and Long Term	Planning with Public Works	Varies by project and issue	City direct budget implications likely to be small, although this does require some allocation of staff time	1) identified coordination with a direct tie to infill; 2) PPACG transportation funding decisions.	Ongoing	
8.A.1	Tools and Incentives	Align plans and priorities for capital improvements and provision of essential public services with infill priority areas, when feasible and appropriate, using a systematic and objective process	Public investments in infill priority areas are often essential to their success. Limited resources need to be strategically aligned and prioritized. Reporting on progress needs to include the status of planned and committed public investments.	TBD Ongoing	Planning; in coordination with multiple departments	Coordinated among departments with input from stakeholder committees and ultimate direction from Mayor and Council	Ongoing, little or no directly added costs	1) Accounting of locations and values of improvements	Not formally initiated. However, GIS-based depictions of projects are commonly used	
8.A.2	Tools and Incentives	Create and adopt an economic development policy that allows the strategic use of City incentives for high priority infill projects (including those with residential uses)	Most unique City incentives have customarily been limited to "economic development" projects that result in some combination of significant primary employment, sales tax generation and/or substantial utilities use. Some important infill projects, may not contribute as directly to these categories but are none-the-less recommended for priority due to their overall contribution to community benefits.	Short to Long Term	Community Vitality; Planning	Case-by-case; staff and developer; approved by Council	Ongoing and as needed	1) Overall and area-specific success of infill. 2) Number of projects incentivized, 3) Some analysis of community benefit		
8.A.3	Tools and Incentives	Prepare and adopt an adaptable City Urban Renewal Policy aligned with this Infill Chapter	The use of urban renewal designation is arguably the most important single infill-supportive tool and incentive directly available to the City. Historically most, urban renewal requests have been brought forward to the Urban Renewal Authority without benefit of an adopted framework of priorities for areas and outcomes. Within the City, more areas potentially qualify than can be logically designated in a fiscally prudent manner. Therefore, if one of the recommended strategies is to effectively use urban renewal to promote infill, it would be beneficial to have an adopted policy, aligned with infill goals, outcomes and priorities.	Medium Term	URA; Planning; Mayor; Council	Staff; URA;EV; stakeholders ; Council	Costs limited to staff time and process	1) Adaptable and updateable policy adopted and in place	Not formally initiated	Many of the aspects this policy exist in practice, direction and working philosophy; important not to actually designate areas until projects are identified and ready- due to 25-year clock
8.A.4	Tools and Incentives	Provide fee waivers and staff support to create special districts to install or maintain public infrastructure in infill and redevelopment areas, especially for the care and maintenance of existing developed areas.	Special districts (primarily metropolitan districts and BIDs) are routinely used by developers newer part of the City to shift a portion of the public improvements costs to future property owners, obtain tax-exempt financing, and sometimes for ongoing maintenance. Waiving application fees for infill area developers could provide a minor cost advantage especially for smaller project areas. Districts can also provide an option to upgrade or maintain streetscapes in already developed areas.	Short to Medium Term	Planning	Process fee waiver resolution; Planning; Attorney; other departments; Council	Limited loss of City General Fund revenue, and staff cost	1) accounting of any districts qualifying for the waiver 2) creation of new district in infill areas	Not initiated	Counter arguments include a potential to slightly encourage more proliferation of districts. Additionally, this cost is minimal compared with the life-cycle costs of operating the district. More likelihood of success in business areas. Some concern with equity impacts.

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
8.A.5	Tools and Incentives	Create, adopt and implement a reasonably objective system and process for evaluating and scoring private infill development projects for the purpose of providing incentives	Incentives (as addressed in this Action Plan) are important to the success of development projects. Because many projects can make some case for incentives, an objective but adaptable system should be in place to establish eligibility and thresholds necessary for their provision. Consistency with the Guiding Principles and Goals of the Infill Plan should be one of the key criteria used in this system along with the economic development and urban renewal policies recommended in this Action Plan.	Short to Medium Term	Planning and Economic Vitality	Create and adopt system and process; staff; stakeholders including RBA; Council	Costs limited to staff time and process	1) Creation and adoption of process and system; 2) experience with implementation	Not initiated	As noted there are important factors and outcomes with an essential nexus to economic development but not always to infill (e.g. primary job attraction and retention). The evaluation/scoring systems needs to reflect all of the desired goals and outcomes
8.A.6	Tools and Incentives	Develop, adopt and proactively apply criteria for evaluating, a system and process for evaluating and potentially adapting public and civic, and insitutional projects and uses for consistency with the Infill Plan.	The City naturally has the most influence on the projects and uses it is directly or indirectly responsible for. Other institutional uses (e.g. hospitals and major educational facilities) have a particular strong nexus with infill goals and City services and infrastructure. Therefore, criteria should be developed to assure that these projects and uses are reasonably aligned with the goals of the Infill Plan, including their location and design.	Medium Term	Planning; City Departments	Staff; Departments; Council	Costs limited to staff time and process	1) Creation and adoption of process and system; 2) experience with implementation	Not initiated	
8.A.7	Tools and Incentives	Provide effective Rapid Response for high priority infill projects	The City's staff level Rapid Response process involves pulling together a review team early in the development review process to problem solve and reasonably expedite the processing for key projects often tied to economic development (i.e. primary jobs, net sales tax increase etc.). This process loses its validity if becomes too diluted. However, it could be expanded to the review of a limited number of infill projects that appear to be have a high level of consistency with priorities, goals and outcomes of the Infill Chapter.	Ongoing	Economic Vitality; Planning	Multi-departmental team	limited direct cost	1) some reporting. 2) Anecdotal responses	Could easily be phased in (with some guidance)	Some infill projects already qualify based on current reasoning. Some others have merited focused attention less formally.
9.A.1	Other Recommendations	Support efforts to address construction defects litigation that adversely impacts certain infill housing project types	The current construction defects law is making it almost impossible to build new condominiumized projects of any type. These types of projects can be particularly important for infill. Although this is a Statewide issue, and may not be entirely solvable at the local level, the City can support a variety of efforts to address and mitigate the impact.	Short Term (if possible)	Attorney; City Council; Mayor	Staff; City Council; coordination with other municipalities	limited primarily to staff time	1) Council ordinance adopted 2) Effective State legislation passed or other approach implemented 3) Actual increase in construction of multiple ownership attached units constructed	Council ordinance adopted as of December, 2015; additional attention may be required at the State level and locally	critical for success of attached units with multiple ownership
9.A.2	Other Recommendations	Assume a proactive role in resolving stormwater and floodplain management challenges particular to infill areas	Addressing stormwater and floodplain management issues and requirements can be particularly challenging for infill areas and projects because of the complexities associated with multiple ownerships, small sites, limited available land, obsolete or inadequate systems and new requirements (e.g. managing for both stormwater quality and quantity. Without the City playing a coordinating role, these issues can become a barrier to redevelopment development.	Short to Long Term	Public Works/ Stormwater	varies	varies	1) Coordinated stormwater facilities plans in place 2) floodplain management systems and/or	Ongoing	

Number	Recommendation Category	Recommendation	Problem Statement/ Justification	Timeframe	Accountability/ Responsibilities	Process	Budget/ Cost Considerations	Measures of Success	Status	Key Elements and Other Comments
9.A.3	Other Recommendations	Effectively address issues of inconsistency between the Fire Code and the Building Code via a combination of code reconciliation and/or enhanced communication among agencies and with customers	The adopted Pikes Peak Regional Building Code and the City's Fire Code do not match in some areas. This can complicate and sometimes add cost to the process, particularly for unique architectural and construction projects, and especially if fully effective communication does not occur among all parties.	Medium Term	Fire Department	TBD	limited primarily to staff time	TBD	not initiated	
<i>Last Updated 12/17/15</i>										
	Short Term- Within 12 Months									
	Intermediate Term- Within 3 years									
	Longer Term- 3+ Years									
	Notes									
1) Overall Action Plan project management assumed to reside with Planning & Community Development Department and Comprehensive Planning Division; with various departments and other entities assuming "ownership" of applicable actions designating a liaison for some of the others; For many of these recommendations, there is an assumed important public communications role.										
2) All Utilities related recommendations have unique processes and accountabilities related to the CSU enterprise.										
3) With the exception of the basic recommendations, it is assumed this table will be regularly updated in order to keep it viable and current. New or amended recommended actions could be added and completed or no-longer-viable actions could be moved to another sheet										
Abbreviations										
	Attorney	City Attorney's Office								
	CONO	Council of Neighbors and Organizations								
	Council	City Council								
	CPD	Comprehensive Planning Division								
	CSU	Colorado Springs Utilities								
	CTAB	Citizen's Transportation Advisory Board								
	DDA	Colorado Springs Downtown Development Authority								
	DRB	Downtown Design Review Board								
	DRE	Development Review Enterprise								
	FBZ	form based zoning								
	IDP	Imagine Downtown Plan								
	Infill Plan	City of Colorado Springs Infill Comprehensive Plan Supplement								
	LUR	Land Use Review Division								
	Parks	Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department								
	PC	Planning Commission								
	Planning	Planning & Community Development Department								
	PLDO	Park Lands Dedication Ordinance								
	PPACG	Pikes Peak Area Council of Governments								
	PPRBD	Pikes Peak Regional Building Department								
	PPRTA	Pikes Peak Rural Transportation Authority								
	PW	Public Works Department								
	RBA	Colorado Springs Regional Business Alliance								
	Transit	Transit Services Division								
	UB	Utilities Board								
	UPAC	Utilities Policy Advisory Committee								
	URA	Urban Renewal Authority								
	URRs	CSU Utilities Rules and Regulations								