

**Conditions Study for  
Tejon and Costilla Partial Block  
Colorado Springs, Colorado**

Prepared for:

Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority (CSURA)  
30 South Nevada Avenue, Suite 502  
Colorado Springs CO 80903

Prepared by:

**DGC** Consulting

DGC Consulting  
18331 E. Davies Avenue  
Foxfield, CO 80016

FINAL  
February 2018

*Background information and other data have been furnished to DGC Community Planning and Design (DGC) by Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority, Colorado Springs Downtown Development Authority, City of Colorado Spring, and/or third parties, which DGC has used in preparing this report. DGC has relied on this information as furnished, and is neither responsible for nor has confirmed the accuracy of this information.*

## Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction</b>                        | <b>5</b>  |
| 1.1. Purpose                                  | 5         |
| 1.2. Colorado Urban Renewal Law               | 5         |
| 1.3. Study Methodology                        | 7         |
| <b>2. Study Area Analysis</b>                 | <b>8</b>  |
| 2.1 Study Area                                | 8         |
| 2.2 Existing Conditions                       | 11        |
| 2.3 Field Survey Approach                     | 15        |
| 2.4 Desktop Analysis                          | 15        |
| 2.5 Blight Factor Evaluation Criteria         | 15        |
| 2.6 Results of the Study Area Analysis        | 19        |
| <b>3. Summary of Findings and Conclusions</b> | <b>28</b> |
| 3.1 Findings                                  | 28        |
| 3.2 Conclusions                               | 29        |

## List of Exhibits

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Exhibit 2-1: Study Area Boundary Map          | 9  |
| Exhibit 2-2: Study Area Regional Location Map | 10 |
| Exhibit 2-3: Study Area Parcel Map            | 13 |
| Exhibit 3-1: Field Survey Photo-Reference Map | 31 |

## List of Figures

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Figure 2-1 Deteriorated exterior walls and finishes; deteriorated windows and doors; deteriorated loading areas; presence of debris adjacent to structure; debris near high traffic areas; Inadequate site maintenance; non-conformance to development regulations; presence of debris next to structures (Photo 1)  | 25 |
| Figure 2-2 Cracked or uneven pedestrian surfaces; poor drainage; presence of trash and debris; potentially hazardous conditions; deteriorated drainage facilities; inadequate site maintenance; non-conformance to development regulations; debris near structures; fire hazards near structures; dead shrubs near high traffic areas; (Photo 2)   | 25 |
| Figure 2-3 Deteriorated exterior walls; deteriorated exterior finishes; deteriorated doors and windows; cracked or uneven pedestrian surfaces; presence of trash and debris; potentially hazardous materials and conditions; deterioration of signage; trees and shrubs in high traffic areas (Photo 5)  | 26 |
| Figure 2-4 Deteriorated walls/fences; presence of trash and debris; trip/fall hazards; inadequate site maintenance; non-conformance to development regulations; deteriorated sidewalks in the right-of-way; dry debris a near structures; hazardous materials near structures (Photo 6)  | 26 |
| Figure 2-5 Deteriorated loading areas/ramps; cracked or uneven pedestrian surfaces; poor drainage; presence of trash and debris; potentially hazardous conditions; unsafe level changes; deteriorated parking lot pavement; lack of sidewalks or pedestrian areas; deteriorated surface drainage; inadequate site maintenance; lack of conformance to site development regulations; dry debris near structures; unsafe level changes (Photo 9) | 27 |

Figure 2-6 Deteriorated external walls; deteriorated exterior finishes; deteriorated gutters/downspouts; deteriorated walls/fences/gates; cracked or uneven pedestrian surfaces; presence of trash and debris; deteriorated parking lot paving; inadequate site maintenance, non-conformance to development regulations (Photo 12) ..... 27

## List of Tables

Table 2-1: Study Area Surrounding Land Uses..... 11  
Table 2-2: Study Area Parcels Surveyed..... 12  
Table 2-3: Study Area Observed Conditions Summary ..... 23  
Table 2-3: Study Area Observed Conditions Summary (cont'd) ..... 24  
Table 3-1: Photographic/Desktop Analysis Reference Sheet..... 32  
Table 3-1: Photographic/Desktop Analysis Reference Sheet (cont'd) ..... 33

## Appendix

Appendix A: Sources Consulted

## 1. Introduction

This report presents the conditions (“blight”) survey, analysis, findings and underlying rationale for the Tejon and Costilla Partial Block Conditions Study (“Conditions Study”, or “Study”), which was undertaken by DGC Community Planning and Design (“DGC”). DGC conducted the field survey in October, 2017.

### 1.1. Purpose

The purpose of the Study is to determine whether there exists slum or blight conditions within the Tejon and Costilla Partial Block Conditions Study Area (“Study Area”) within the meaning of Colorado Urban Renewal Law, and whether the Study Area should be recommended for such urban renewal efforts as the Colorado Springs Urban Renewal Authority (“CSURA”) and the City of Colorado Springs (“Colorado Springs”) may deem appropriate to remediate existing conditions of slum or blight and to prevent further deterioration and blight.

### 1.2. Colorado Urban Renewal Law

In the Colorado Urban Renewal Law, Colorado Revised Statutes § 31-25-101 et seq. (the “Urban Renewal Law”), the legislature has declared that an area of slum or blight.

*...constitutes a serious and growing menace, injurious to the public health, safety, morals, and welfare of the residents of the state in general and municipalities thereof; that the existence of such areas contributes substantially to the spread of disease and crime, constitutes an economic and social liability, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of municipalities, retards the provision of housing accommodations, aggravates traffic problems and impairs or arrests the elimination of traffic hazards and the improvement of traffic facilities; and that the prevention and elimination of slums and blight is a matter of public policy and statewide concern....*

Before remedial action can be taken by a public agency, however, the Urban Renewal Law requires a finding by the appropriate governing body that an area exhibits conditions of slum or blight.

The determination that an area constitutes a slum or blighted area is a cumulative conclusion attributable to the presence of several physical, environmental, and social factors. Indeed, slum or blight is attributable to a multiplicity of conditions, which, in combination, tend to accelerate the phenomenon of deterioration of an area. For purposes of this study, the definition of a blighted area articulated in the Urban Renewal Law follows:

*“Blighted area” means an area that, in its present condition and use and, by reason of the presence of at least four of the following factors, substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the municipality, retards the provision of housing accommodations, or constitutes an economic or social liability, and is a menace to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare:*

- a. Slum, deteriorated, or deteriorating structures;*

- b. Predominance of defective or inadequate street layout;*
- c. Faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility, or usefulness;*
- d. Unsanitary or unsafe conditions;*
- e. Deterioration of site or other improvements;*
- f. Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities;*
- g. Defective or unusual conditions of title rendering the title non-marketable;*
- h. The existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire and other causes;*
- i. Buildings that are unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work in because of building code violations, dilapidation, deterioration, defective design, physical construction, or faulty or inadequate facilities;*
- j. Environmental contamination of buildings or property; or*
- k.5 The existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements; or*
- l. If there is no objection by the property owner or owners and the tenant or tenants of such owner or owners, if any, to the inclusion of such property in an urban renewal area, “blighted area” also means an area that, in its present condition and use and, by reason of the presence of any one of the factors specified in paragraphs (a) to (k.5) of this subsection (2), substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the municipality, liability, and is a menace to the public health, safety, morals, or welfare. For purposes of this paragraph (l), the fact that an owner of an interest in such property does not object to the inclusion of such property in the urban renewal area does not mean that the owner has waived any rights of such owner in connection with laws governing condemnation.*

To be able to use the powers of eminent domain, “blighted” means that five of the eleven factors must be present (Colorado Revised Statutes § 31-25-105.5(2) (a) (l)).

Only one factor must be present if the property owner or owners and the tenant or tenants of such owner or owners do not object to the finding (Colorado Revised Statutes § 31-25-105.5(2) (l)).

Several principles have been developed by Colorado courts to guide the determination of whether an area constitutes a blighted area under the Urban Renewal Law. First, the absence of widespread violation of building and health codes does not, by itself, preclude a finding of blight. The definition of “blighted area contained in the Urban Renewal Law is broad and encompasses not only those areas containing properties so dilapidated as to justify condemnation as nuisances, but also envisions the prevention of deterioration.” Second, the presence of one well maintained building does not defeat a determination that an area constitutes a blighted area. A determination of blight is based upon an area “taken as a whole,” and not on a building-by-building basis. Third, a governing body’s “determination as to whether an area is blighted... is a legislative question and the scope of review by the judiciary is restricted.” A court’s role in reviewing such a blight determination is simply to independently verify if

the conclusion is based upon factual evidence determined by the governing body at the time of a public hearing to be consistent with the statutory definition.

### **1.3. Study Methodology**

DGC was retained to perform an independent survey of the Study Area and to determine if it contains conditions of slum or blight so as to constitute a blighted area under the Urban Renewal Law. Based upon the conditions observed in the field, this Study makes a recommendation as to whether the Study Area is blighted within the meaning of the Urban Renewal Law. The actual determination itself remains the responsibility of the legislative body, in this case, the City of Colorado Springs City Council.

An important objective of this study is to obtain and evaluate data on a wide range of physical and non-physical conditions that are present in the Study Area. Data about the Study Area was collected, analyzed, and ultimately portrayed through three carefully performed tasks:

- Task 1: Project Initiation, Data Collection and Mapping
- Task 2: Field Survey, Research and Verification
- Task 3: Documentation and Presentation of Findings

Tasks 1 and 2 are described in Section 2, Study Area Analysis. Task 3 is described in Section 3, Summary of Findings.

## **2. Study Area Analysis**

### **2.1 Study Area**

The Study Area includes approximately 1.5 acres of privately and publicly-owned parcels and public rights-of-way. It is shown on Exhibit 2-1: Study Area Boundary Map. The Study Area includes four city lots in a city block bounded on the north by East Costilla Street, on the east by South Tejon Street, on the south by East Cimarron Street, and on the west by South Nevada Avenue. The location of the Study Area within Central Colorado Springs is shown in Exhibit 2-2: Study Area Regional Location Map.



### Exhibit 2-1: Study Area Boundary Map



LEGEND

 Study Area


Study Area Boundary Map



**DGC** Consulting

Base Map Source:  
Google Earth Pro, November 16, 2017

### Exhibit 2-2: Study Area Regional Location Map



**LEGEND**

 Study Area

Study Area Regional Location Map



**DGC** Consulting

Base Map Source:  
Open Street Map, November 14, 2017

## 2.2 Existing Conditions

### Background:

This Conditions Study was conducted on October 31, 2017, followed by research and desktop analysis of physical conditions. The site improvements, buildings, streets and other features shown on the aerial imagery provided by the City and Google Map were consistent with conditions observed during the field survey.

### Development and Land Use:

The Study Area is the northeast portion of a city block in Downtown Colorado Springs. The block is a mix of one and two story older commercial buildings, older residential buildings, and surface parking lots. The area surrounding the block has a similar urban land use pattern, as well as a new multi-level parking garage on East Costilla Street to the north. Although some of the older commercial buildings have been renovated (such as conversion from retail to office), most of the area has declined during past decades.

According the [Downtown Colorado Springs Market Assessment](#) (prepared by Progressive Urban Management Associates, January 27, 2016), Downtown Colorado Springs is benefitting to market trends that are favorable to downtowns throughout the United States. Downtown Colorado Springs is the strongest office segment and downtown retail is experiencing healthy/low vacancy rates. It has other assets which benefit from national recreation and fitness trends– these include the U.S. Olympic Committee headquarters, outdoor recreation opportunities, and the planned Olympic Museum. However, downtown residential is lagging but there may be future opportunities for new residential development.

Land uses are summarized in Table 2-1: Study Area Surrounding Land Uses.

**Table 2-1: Study Area Surrounding Land Uses**

| Subarea  | Land Use  |
|--|---|
| Study Area (4 parcels plus public R.O.W.)      | Vacant commercial building, surface parking lots, office building.                                    |
| North of Study Area (E. Costilla Ave.)         | Public R.O.W., commercial retail, surface parking lots, multi-story parking structure.                |
| East of Study Area (S. Tejon St.)              | Public R.O.W., commercial retail, surface parking lots.   |
| South of Study Area (private parcels)          | Public R.O.W., commercial retail, surface parking lots.   |
| West of Study Area (alley and private parcels) | Single-family residential, commercial retail, commercial office, public R.O.W., surface parking lots. |
| <i>Source: Google Earth imagery (2016)</i>     |   |

**Zoning:**

The Study Area is in the Central Sector of the City of Colorado Springs Form Based Code, which covers the majority of Downtown Colorado Springs. The Central Sector is envisioned as being the heart of downtown with the highest building densities both horizontally and vertically. The Central Sector is intended to have commercial uses (retail, restaurant, entertainment and office) on the first level of most buildings, with residential, lodging and office uses on the upper levels. The City’s primary goal for the Central Sector is to increase downtown density, create an iconic skyline and establish a high-quality pedestrian environment at street level. There is no maximum building height minimum parking requirements in the Central Sector. Standards and guidelines in the Code will be applicable to development in the Study Area.

**Parcels Surveyed:**

The Study Area includes four privately-owned parcels totaling .87 acres (38,000 SF), plus public right-of-way. Assessor’s information is summarized on Table 2-2: Study Area Parcels Surveyed. The parcel boundaries are illustrated on Exhibit 2-3: Study Area Parcel Map.



**Table 2-2: Study Area Parcels Surveyed**

| Ref ID | Parcel Number | Description            | Parcel Address | Property Owner              | Parcel Size (SF) | Parcel Size (Acres) |
|--------|---------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| 1      | 64183-16-001  | Special purpose        | 402 S TEJON ST | ATC1 EXCHANGE LLC           | 9,500            | 0.22                |
| 2      | 64183-16-003  | Vacant commercial lots | 408 S TEJON ST | ATC1 EXCHANGE LLC           | 9,500            | 0.22                |
| 3      | 64183-16-004  | Commercial office      | 410 S TEJON ST | 410 - 412 S TEJON LLC       | 9,500            | 0.22                |
| 4      | 64183-16-007  | Commercial office      | 414 S TEJON ST | BOMB SHELTER PROPERTIES LLC | 9,500            | 0.22                |
|        |               |                        |                | TOTAL                       | 38,000           | 0.87                |


### Exhibit 2-3: Study Area Parcel Map



LEGEND

-  Study Area
-  64183-16-007 Study Parcel and ID Number

Study Area Parcel Map



Base Map Source:  
Google Earth Pro, November 16, 2017

**Streets and Utilities:**

City of Colorado Springs Utilities is a municipal utility that is obligated to serve customers within its service area, which includes the Study Area. The utility provides water, wastewater, gas, and electric service. Based on information provided by Colorado Springs Utilities, both eastern and western parts of the Study Area have existing utilities in the street and alley rights-of-way. Although some of this infrastructure dates from the late 1800’s, this is not considered to be unusual. Telephone and telecommunications infrastructure in the Study Area are provided by private utilities.

**Environmental:**

Environmental cleanup or contamination documents or information were not reviewed for this Study.

**Vacancy and Underutilization:**

Conditions of vacancy and underutilization in the Study Area were observed in the field survey and Desktop Analysis. First, the site survey noted four separate parcels with: one vacant building, one parcel used for parking, and two buildings that were occupied. This represents a 50% building or parcel vacancy rate, which is much less developed than other parts of Downtown Colorado Springs.

Second, a desktop analysis of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in the Study Area confirmed these observations. FAR is a measurement of overall development density which can indicate physical underutilization. The Study Area includes 23,460 SF of development (buildings) on 38,000 SF private land (according to El Paso County Assessor records). This information was used to calculate an average FAR of .62 in the Study Area, significantly less dense than urban core development which typically has an FAR of 1.0 or 2.0.

| Description      | Area (SF) |
|------------------|-----------|
| Building area    | 23,460    |
| Parcel Area      | 38,000    |
| Floor Area Ratio | 0.62      |

Taken together, these observations corroborate each other and are evidence of substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements.

**Fire and Emergency Response**

No evidence of structural or other fires was observed in the field survey. In addition, documentation about fire incidence was also reviewed for relevance to this Study. The [City of Colorado Springs Fire Department 2016 Annual Report Statistical Abstract](#) summarizes information about emergency responses (which includes fire, medical, and other) by fire station. The Study Area is served by Station 3, which in 2016 had a lower number of station responses (2,477) compared with Fire Station 8, which was the highest (6,691). Station 3 was also significantly lower than the average for all 22 stations (3,427

responses). In addition, between 2012 and 2016 Station 3 also has the second lowest growth in response rate (.6%) compared with the average of all stations (5.1% growth).

## **Crime**

Crime information was not reviewed for this Study.

## **2.3 Field Survey Approach**

The physical site survey was conducted on October 31, 2017. The majority of the blight factors were addressed during the site visit – exceptions being those which were not considered or were analyzed through “desktop analysis” (see description below). Each observation of a blight factor observed during the field survey, as described in Section 1, was tallied on a survey matrix and documented with a photograph (which is cross referenced). The field survey information is summarized as follows:

- Locations of the observations and photographs are documented on an aerial photo for the survey area (Exhibit 3-1: Field Survey Photo-Reference Map). Note that the numbers on the aerial image reference numbered photos in the tables.
- The survey observations are summarized on Table 2-3: Study Area Observed Conditions Summary. A more detailed list of observations is included in Chapter 3. Note again the cross-referencing of numbered photos.
- The narrative is supplemented with relevant photographs that highlight the observations. A complete set of photographs is included in Chapter 3.

## **2.4 Desktop Analysis**

In addition to the field survey, further analysis was performed in an office setting. This “desktop analysis” (D.A. on the tables) included review of information provided by CSURA, City of Colorado Springs, Downtown Colorado Springs Development Authority (DDA), El Paso County Assessor website data, public domain aerial photography, and other documentation in order to comprehensively assess the existing conditions within the Study Area. The following factors were evaluated in the desktop analysis:

- b. Defective or inadequate street layout
- c. Faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility, or usefulness
- k.5 The existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements

## **2.5 Blight Factor Evaluation Criteria**

DGC Community Planning and Design developed the following evaluation criteria for examination of the eleven blight factors (a through k.5). These criteria were evaluated during the field survey and review of available supplemental documentation during the desktop analysis. Each factor is noted with the methodology for analysis (field, desktop, or both).

**a. Slum, deteriorating or deteriorated structures**

Field survey efforts examining this factor focused on the general condition and level of deterioration of the existing building's exterior components, such as:

- Deteriorated exterior walls
- Deteriorated visible foundation/ incomplete demolition
- Deteriorated fascia, soffits, and/or eaves
- Deteriorated/ lack of gutters and/or downspouts
- Deteriorated exterior finishes
- Deteriorated windows or doors
- Deteriorated stairways and/or fire escapes
- Deteriorated loading dock areas and/or ramps
- Deteriorated barriers, walls, gates, and/or fences
- Deteriorated ancillary structures
- Other (exposed electrical; incomplete demolition)

**b. Predominance of defective or inadequate street layout**

The analysis conducted for this blight factor evaluated the effectiveness or adequacy of the streets within the Study Area. Evaluation criteria in this section include:

- Poor vehicle access
- Poor internal circulation
- Substandard driveway definition and/or curb cuts
- Poor parking lot layout
- Other (poor street layout and access)

**c. Faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility, or usefulness**

The analysis conducted for this blight factor evaluated the adequacy of the lot layout within the Study Area. Evaluation criteria in this section include:

- Faulty and/or irregular lot shape
- Faulty and/or irregular lot configuration
- Lack of access to a public street
- Inadequate lot size
- Other

**d. Unsanitary or unsafe conditions**

The presence of the following conditions could contribute to an unsafe or unsanitary environment within the Study Area and surrounding community:

- Poorly lit or unlit areas



- Cracked or uneven surfaces for pedestrians
- Poor drainage
- Insufficient grading or steep slopes
- Presence of trash and debris
- Presence of abandoned or inoperable vehicles or equipment
- Presence of hazardous materials or conditions
- Presence of vagrants, vandalism, and/or graffiti
- Other hazards present (unsafe level changes/drop-offs)

**e. Deterioration of site or other improvements**

This factor focuses on conditions that indicate the lack of general maintenance of a structure, site, or through the presence of these conditions, the environment that reduces the site's usefulness and desirability. The conditions are as follows:

- Deterioration or lack of parking lot or site pavement
- Deterioration or lack of site curb and gutter
- Deterioration or lack site sidewalks and pedestrian areas
- Deterioration or lack of outdoor lighting
- Deterioration or lack of site utilities
- Deterioration or lack of surface drainage facilities
- Inadequate site maintenance
- Non-conformance to site development regulations
- Deterioration of signage
- Other hazards present (unsafe level changes/drop-offs, fire risk)

**f. Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities**

This factor identifies key deficiencies in the off-site and on-site public infrastructure and topography within the Study Area, including:

- Poor site grading
- Deterioration of street pavement in right-of-way
- Deterioration or lack of curb and gutter in right-of-way
- Insufficient street lighting in right-of-way
- Presence of overhead utilities in right-of-way
- Deterioration or lack of sidewalks in right-of-way
- Deteriorated utilities in right-of-way
- Other (unsafe level changes, trip/fall hazard)

**g. Defective or unusual conditions of title rendering the title nonmarketable**

This factor is evaluated through research and analysis of title documents and potential encumbrances. Existence of these criteria contributes to prolonged periods of vacancy and hinders redevelopment:

- Title conditions making the property unmarketable

- Other (easements and other encumbrances)

**h. The existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes**

The presence of these criteria within the Study Area can endanger human lives and property:

- Structures in the floodplain
- Evidence of previous fire
- Inadequate emergency vehicle provisions
- Presence of dry debris adjacent to structures
- Hazardous materials near structures
- Dead trees/shrubs near high traffic areas or structures
- Other hazards present (unsafe level changes; trip/fall hazard)

**i. Buildings which are unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work in because of building code violations, dilapidation, deterioration, defective design, physical construction, or faulty or inadequate facilities**

The criteria for this factor are focused primarily on defective or dangerous conditions within the building envelope and require internal access to the structure for full assessment:

- Building code violations
- Public health concerns
- Dilapidated or deteriorated interior of building
- Defective design or physical construction
- Faulty or inadequate facilities
- Presence of mold
- Inadequate emergency egress provisions
- Evidence of recent flooding
- Unprotected electrical systems, wires, and/or gas lines
- Inadequate fire suppression systems
- Evidence of vagrants inside building
- Other

**j. Environmental contamination of buildings or property**

The presence of environmental contamination hinders redevelopment through added costs and is potentially hazardous to the surrounding community. These conditions are typically not evident through a visual field survey:

- Official documentation of environmental contamination
- Storage or evidence of hazardous materials
- Other evidence of environmental contamination

**k.5 The existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements**

These additional criteria are typically not visible during a field survey, but could hinder redevelopment when present:

- High levels of vacancy
- High levels of municipal code violations
- High levels of vehicular accident reports
- High levels of requests for emergency services
- Other evidence of required high level of municipal services
- Other evidence of substantial physical underutilization

## **2.6 Results of the Study Area Analysis**

The overall findings of the Study Area analysis are presented in this section. Table 2-3: Study Area Observed Conditions Summary tabulates the results of the field survey and desktop analysis and Figures 2-2 to 2-13 present representative photographs that illustrate field observations. A complete set of photographs that correlate by number with Photographic/Desktop Analysis Reference Sheets is included in Exhibit 3-2.

After review of the eleven (11) blight factors described in Colorado Urban Renewal Law, the following six (6) factors were observed within the Study Area during the field survey or by subsequent desktop research and analysis:

- a. Slum, deteriorated, or deteriorating structures
- d. Unsanitary or unsafe conditions
- e. Deterioration of site or other improvements
- f. Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities
- h. The existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes
- k.5 The existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements

Three (2) factors evaluated as part of the survey and desktop analysis were not found to predominate in the Study Area.

- b. Defective or inadequate street layout
- c. Faulty lot layout

Three (3) factors were not surveyed as part of this study:

- g. Defective or unusual conditions of title rendering the title nonmarketable
- j. Environmental contamination
- i. Buildings which are unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work in because of building code violations, dilapidation, deterioration, defective design, physical construction, or faulty or inadequate facilities

**a. Slum, deteriorated, or deteriorating structures –OBSERVED**

Two of buildings in the Study Area had deteriorated exteriors – characterized by damaged and dilapidated exterior walls, windows and doors, architectural features, and finishes. Exterior loading docks, walls, and fences were also deteriorated. Much of this was due to the age of buildings, poor exterior condition, and in many cases, vacancy and lack of exterior maintenance. Taken as a whole, slum, deteriorated, and deteriorating structures were observed throughout the Study Area.

**b. Predominance of defective or inadequate street layout – NOT OBSERVED**

Several of the parcels in the Study Area exhibited poor vehicle access, non-existent or substandard driveways, and poor or non-existent parking lot layouts. However, this is not a barrier to development and sufficient to establish a predominance of defective and inadequate street layout.

**c. Faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility, or usefulness – NOT OBSERVED**

The lots in the Study Area are of a uniform size and configuration that can be developed with new structures of the type envisioned in City of Colorado Springs plans and policies. Therefore, poor lot layout conditions are not sufficient to be considered a barrier to development.

**d. Unsanitary or unsafe conditions - OBSERVED**

Multiple conditions were observed indicating unsanitary or unsafe conditions within the Study Area. These include evidence of poor lighting, cracked or uneven surfaces for pedestrians, poor drainage due to the flat nature of the site (which causes pooling of water), presence of trash and debris throughout, abandoned equipment and debris, evidence of vagrants, and unsafe level changes due to overall deterioration of site improvements. Together, these constitute unsanitary and unsafe conditions.

**e. Deterioration of site or other improvements - OBSERVED**

There is widespread deterioration of site improvements within the Study Area. Site pavements are deteriorated, curb and gutter is deteriorated, sidewalks and pedestrian areas are deteriorated, surface drainage is inadequate, site maintenance is inadequate, unsafe level changes, and signage is deteriorated. The vacant and underutilized properties within the Study Area exhibit a lack of site maintenance. These observations are evidence of deteriorated site improvements.

**f. Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities – OBSERVED**

Parcels within the Study Area are served by public and private utilities located in adjacent street rights-of-way and alleys. Water, sewer, natural gas, and electric power provided by Colorado Springs Utilities are reported to be adequate. Telecommunications are provided by private companies. Visible public improvements such as sidewalks, curb and gutter, and landscaping are non-existent or severely

degraded. There were also several examples of unsafe level changes. These observations are evidence of inadequate public improvements or utilities.

**g. Defective or unusual conditions of title rendering the title nonmarketable – NOT SURVEYED**

This factor was not evaluated in the limited scope of this study.

**h. The existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes – OBSERVED**

The field survey identified Study Area parcels with debris and trash next to buildings that could cause fire, other hazardous materials or situations, unsafe level changes, dead trees and shrubs near buildings and high traffic areas and unsafe street access conditions which could contribute to automobile and pedestrian accidents. These observations are evidence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes.

**i. Buildings which are unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work in because of building code violations, dilapidation, deterioration, defective design, physical construction, or faulty or inadequate facilities – NOT SURVEYED**

Although there were several examples of deteriorated building exteriors (discussed previously), this factor, particularly related to building occupancy and interior conditions, was not evaluated in this study.

**j. Environmental contamination of buildings or property - NOT SURVEYED**

No environmental contamination reports or information was reviewed for this Study.

**k.5. The existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements – OBSERVED**

This factor was evaluated with field observations and desktop analysis. First, the site survey noted four separate parcels with: one vacant building, one parcel used for parking, and two buildings that were occupied. This represents a 50% building or parcel vacancy rate, which is much less developed than other parts of Downtown Colorado Springs. Second, a desktop analysis of Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in the Study Area confirmed these observations. FAR is a measurement of overall development density which can indicate physical underutilization. The Study Area includes 23,460 SF of development (buildings) on 38,000 SF of private property (according to El Paso County Assessor records). This information was used to calculate an average FAR of .62 in the Study Area, significantly less dense than urban core development which typically has an FAR of 1.0 or 2.0.

Taken together, these conditions are evidence of substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of parcels, buildings, or other improvements.

**Table 2-3: Study Area Observed Conditions Summary**

| City of Colorado Springs (Tejon and Costilla)<br>Photographic Reference/Desktop Analysis Summary |  |   | F.S. | D.A. |
|--|--|---|------|------|
| a.   | SLUM, DETERIORATED OR<br>DETERIORATING<br>STRUCTURES | Deteriorated external walls                               | •    |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated visible foundation/incomplete demolition     |      |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated fascia/soffits/eaves                         |      |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated/lack of gutters/downspouts                   |      |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated exterior finishes                            |      |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated windows and doors                            | •    |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated stairways/fire escapes                       | •    |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated loading dock areas/ramps                     |      |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated barriers/walls/gates/fences                  | •    |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated ancillary structures                         |      |      |
|  |  | Other (exposed electrical; incomplete demolition)         |      |      |
| b.   | DEFECTIVE OR<br>INADEQUATE STREET<br>LAYOUT          | Poor vehicle access                                       | •    |      |
|  |  | Poor internal circulation                                 |      |      |
|  |  | Substandard driveway definition/curbcuts                  | •    |      |
|  |  | Poor parking lot layout                                   |      |      |
|  |  | Other (poor street layout and access)                     |      |      |
| c.   | FAULTY LOT LAYOUT                                    | Faulty/irregular lot shape                                |      |      |
|  |  | Faulty/irregular lot configuration                        |      |      |
|  |  | Lack of access to a public street                         |      |      |
|  |  | Inadequate lot size                                       |      |      |
|  |  | Other   |      |      |
| d.   | UNSANITARY OR<br>UNSAFE CONDITIONS                   | Poorly lit or unlit areas                                 |      |      |
|  |  | Cracked or uneven surfaces for pedestrians                | •    |      |
|  |  | Poor drainage   | •    |      |
|  |  | Insufficient grading or steep slopes                      |      |      |
|  |  | Presence of trash and debris                              | •    |      |
|  |  | Abandoned/inoperable vehicles and equipment               | •    |      |
|  |  | Presence of potentially hazardous materials or conditions | •    |      |
|  |  | Vagrants/vandalism/graffiti                               | •    |      |
|  |  | Other (unsafe level changes/drop-offs/fire risk)          | •    |      |
| e.   | DETERIORATION OF SITE OR<br>OTHER IMPROVEMENTS       | Deteriorated/lack of parking lot/site pavement            | •    |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated/lack of site curb and gutter                 |      |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated/lack of site sidewalks/pedestrian areas      | •    |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated/lack of outdoor lighting                     |      |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated/substandard/lack of site utilities           |      |      |
|  |  | Deteriorated/lack of surface drainage facilities          | •    |      |
|  |  | Inadequate site maintenance                               | •    |      |
|  |  | Non-conformance to site development regulations           | •    |      |
|  |  | Deterioration of signage                                  | •    |      |
|  |  | Other   |      |      |

Note: Field Survey abbreviated F.S., Desktop Analysis abbreviated D.A., Not Surveyed abbreviated N.S.

Source: DGC Consulting field survey and Google Earth

**Table 2-4: Study Area Observed Conditions Summary (cont'd)**

|     |   |   | F.S. | D.A. |
|-----|---|---|------|------|
| f.  | UNUSUAL TOPOGRAPHY OR INADEQUATE PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS OR UTILITIES   | Poor site grading   | •    |      |
|     |   | Deteriorated/lack of street pavement in right-of-way        | •    |      |
|     |   | Deteriorated/lack of curb and gutter in right-of-way        | •    |      |
|     |   | Insufficient street lighting in right-of-way                | •    |      |
|     |   | Overhead utilities in right-of-way                          |      |      |
|     |   | Deteriorated/inadequate/lack of sidewalks in right-of-way   | •    |      |
|     |   | Deteriorated/unsafe utilities in the right-of-way           | •    |      |
|     | Other (unsafe level changes; trip/fall hazard)  | •   |      |      |
| g.  | DEFECTIVE OR UNUSUAL TITLE CONDITIONS   | Title conditions making the property unmarketable           | NS   | NS   |
|     |   | Other (easements and other encumbrances)                    |      |      |
| h.  | THE EXISTENCE OF CONDITIONS THAT ENDANGER LIFE OR PROPERTY BY FIRE OR OTHER CAUSES  | Structures in the floodplain                                |      |      |
|     |   | Evidence of previous fire                                   |      |      |
|     |   | Inadequate emergency vehicle provisions                     |      |      |
|     |   | Presence of dry debris adjacent to structures               | •    |      |
|     |   | Hazardous materials near structures/fire hazard             | •    |      |
|     |   | Dead trees/shrubs near high traffic areas                   | •    |      |
|     | Other (unsafe level changes; trip/fall hazard)  | •   |      |      |
| i.  | BUILDINGS THAT ARE UNSAFE / UNHEALTHY FOR PERSONS TO LIVE / WORK IN BECAUSE OF BUILDING CODE VIOLATIONS, DILAPIDATION, DETERIORATION, DEFECTIVE DESIGN, PHYSICAL CONSTRUCTION, OR FAULTY OR INADEQUATE FACILITIES | Building code violations                                    |      |      |
|     |   | Public health concerns                                      |      |      |
|     |   | Dilapidated or deteriorated interior of building            |      |      |
|     |   | Defective design or physical construction                   |      |      |
|     |   | Faulty or inadequate facilities                             |      |      |
|     |   | Presence of mold  |      |      |
|     |   | Inadequate emergency egress provisions                      | NS   | NS   |
|     |   | Evidence of recent flooding                                 |      |      |
|     |   | Unprotected electrical systems/wires/gas lines              |      |      |
|     |   | Inadequate fire suppression systems                         |      |      |
|     |   | Evidence of vagrants inside building                        |      |      |
|     | Other (fire hazard)   |   |      |      |
| j.  | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION   | Official documentation of contamination                     |      |      |
|     |   | Storage or evidence of hazardous materials                  | NS   | NS   |
|     |   | Other evidence of environmental contamination               |      |      |
| k.5 | REQUIRES HIGH LEVELS OF MUNICIPAL SERVICES OR SITES/ BUILDINGS/ IMPROVEMENTS UNDERUTILIZED/ VACANT  | High levels of vacancy                                      | •    | •    |
|     |   | High levels of municipal code violations                    |      |      |
|     |   | High levels of vehicular accident reports                   |      |      |
|     |   | High levels of requests for emergency services              |      |      |
|     |   | Other evidence of required high level of municipal services |      |      |
|     |   | Other evidence of substantial physical underutilization     | •    | •    |

Note: Field Survey abbreviated F.S., Desktop Analysis abbreviated D.A., Not Surveyed abbreviated N.S.

Source: DGC Consulting field survey and Google Earth





**Figure 2-1 Deteriorated exterior walls and finishes; deteriorated windows and doors; deteriorated loading areas; presence of debris adjacent to structure; debris near high traffic areas; Inadequate site maintenance; non-conformance to development regulations; presence of debris next to structures (Photo 1)**



**Figure 2-2 Cracked or uneven pedestrian surfaces; poor drainage; presence of trash and debris; potentially hazardous conditions; deteriorated drainage facilities; inadequate site maintenance; non-conformance to development regulations; debris near structures; fire hazards near structures; dead shrubs near high traffic areas; (Photo 2)**



**Figure 2-3 Deteriorated exterior walls; deteriorated exterior finishes; deteriorated doors and windows; cracked or uneven pedestrian surfaces; presence of trash and debris; potentially hazardous materials and conditions; deterioration of signage; trees and shrubs in high traffic areas (Photo 5)**



**Figure 2-4 Deteriorated walls/fences; presence of trash and debris; trip/fall hazards; inadequate site maintenance; non-conformance to development regulations; deteriorated sidewalks in the right-of-way; dry debris a near structures; hazardous materials near structures (Photo 6)**



**Figure 2-5 Deteriorated loading areas/ramps; cracked or uneven pedestrian surfaces; poor drainage; presence of trash and debris; potentially hazardous conditions; unsafe level changes; deteriorated parking lot pavement; lack of sidewalks or pedestrian areas; deteriorated surface drainage; inadequate site maintenance; lack of conformance to site development regulations; dry debris near structures; unsafe level changes (Photo 9)**



**Figure 2-6 Deteriorated external walls; deteriorated exterior finishes; deteriorated gutters/downspouts; deteriorated walls/fences/gates; cracked or uneven pedestrian surfaces; presence of trash and debris; deteriorated parking lot paving; inadequate site maintenance, non-conformance to development regulations (Photo 12)**

## **3. Summary of Findings and Conclusions**

### **3.1 Findings**

Within the Tejon and Costilla Partial Block Study Area, the field survey and desktop analysis identified thirty (30) different conditions representing six (6) different factors that contribute to a finding of blight. Specific examples and photo documentation from the field survey/desktop analysis is documented on Exhibit 3-1: Field Survey Photo Reference Map and Table 3-1 to 3-5: Photographic/Desktop Analysis Reference Sheets. A complete set of survey photographs is included in Exhibit 3-2.

The blight factors and conditions observed are listed below:

**a. Slum, deteriorating or deteriorated structures**

- Deteriorated exterior walls
- Deteriorated windows or doors
- Deteriorated stairways and/or fire escapes
- Deteriorated barriers, walls, and/or gates

**b. Predominance of defective or inadequate street layout**

- Insufficient evidence of factors identified

**c. Faulty lot layout in relation to size, adequacy, accessibility, or usefulness**

- No factors observed or identified

**d. Unsanitary or unsafe conditions**

- Cracked or uneven surfaces for pedestrians
- Poor drainage
- Presence of trash and debris
- Presence of abandoned or inoperable vehicles or equipment
- Presence of hazardous materials or conditions
- Presence of vagrants, vandalism, and/or graffiti
- Other hazards present (unsafe level changes/drop-offs, fire risk)

**e. Deterioration of site or other improvements**

- Deterioration or lack of parking lot or site pavement
- Deterioration or lack site sidewalks and pedestrian areas
- Deterioration or lack of surface drainage facilities
- Inadequate site maintenance
- Non-conformance to site development regulations
- Deterioration of signage

**f. Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities**

- Poor site grading
  - Deterioration of street pavement in right-of-way
  - Deterioration or lack of curb and gutter in right-of-way
  - Insufficient street lighting in right-of-way
  - Deterioration or lack of sidewalks in right-of-way
  - Deteriorated utilities in right-of-way
  - Other (unsafe level changes, trip/fall hazard)
- g. Defective or unusual conditions of title rendering the title nonmarketable**
- Not surveyed
- h. The existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes**
- Presence of dry debris adjacent to structures
  - Hazardous materials near structures
  - Dead trees/shrubs near high traffic areas or structures
  - Other hazards present (unsafe level changes; trip/fall hazard)
- i. Buildings which are unsafe or unhealthy for persons to live or work in because of building code violations, dilapidation, deterioration, defective design, physical construction, or faulty or inadequate facilities**
- Not surveyed
- j. Environmental contamination of buildings or property**
- Not surveyed
- k.5 The existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements**
- High levels of vacancy
  - Other evidence of substantial physical underutilization

## **3.2 Conclusions**

It is the conclusion of this Conditions Study that the Tejon and Costilla Partial Block Colorado Springs Study Area, in its present condition and use, conforms to conditions of a blighted area as defined by Colorado Urban Renewal Law. By reason of the presence of factors identified in the Urban Renewal Law and as documented in this report, the City of Colorado Springs City Council may find that the Study Area substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of Colorado Springs, retards the provision of housing accommodations, or constitutes an economic or social liability, and is a menace to the public health, safety, morals and welfare.

Per Urban Renewal Law, conditions in the Study Area must constitute at least one (1) of the factors indicative of a blighted area (due to the single property owner), and at least five (5) factors if eminent domain is to be used. As described in this report, the following six (6) factors were predominate in the Study Area:

- a. Slum, deteriorated, or deteriorating structures
- d. Unsanitary or unsafe conditions
- e. Deterioration of site or other improvements
- f. Unusual topography or inadequate public improvements or utilities
- h. The existence of conditions that endanger life or property by fire or other causes
- k.5 The existence of health, safety, or welfare factors requiring high levels of municipal services or substantial physical underutilization or vacancy of sites, buildings, or other improvements

The blight factors observed are documented on Exhibit 3-1: Field Survey Photo-Reference Map and Table 3-1 to 3-5: Photographic/Desktop Analysis Reference Sheet. A complete set of survey photographs is included in Exhibit 3-2: Field Survey Photographs.

### Exhibit 3-1: Field Survey Photo-Reference Map



LEGEND

-  Photo Location
-  Study Area
-  Study Parcel



Field Survey Photo-Reference Map



Base Map Source:  
Google Earth Pro, November 16, 2017

**Table 3-1: Photographic/Desktop Analysis Reference Sheet**

| City of Colorado Springs (Tejon and Costilla)<br>Photographic Reference Sheet |  |   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |   |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|
| a.  | SLUM, DETERIORATED OR DETERIORATING STRUCTURES     | Deteriorated external walls                               | • |   | • |   | • |   |   |   |   | •  |    | •  |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated visible foundation/incomplete demolition     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated fascia/soffits/eaves                         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated/lack of gutters/downspouts                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | • |
|   |  | Deteriorated exterior finishes                            | • |   | • |   | • |   |   |   |   |    | •  |    | • |
|   |  | Deteriorated windows and doors                            | • |   | • |   | • |   |   |   |   |    | •  |    |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated stairways/fire escapes                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated loading dock areas/ramps                     | • |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | •  | •  |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated barriers/walls/gates/fences                  |   |   |   |   |   |   | • |   |   |    | •  |    | • |
|   |  | Deteriorated ancillary structures                         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
| Other (exposed electrical; incomplete demolition)                             |  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
| b.  | DEFECTIVE OR INADEQUATE STREET LAYOUT              | Poor vehicle access                                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | • |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Poor internal circulation                                 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Substandard driveway definition/curbcuts                  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | •  |    |    |   |
|   |  | Poor parking lot layout                                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Other (poor street layout and access)                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
| c.  | FAULTY LOT LAYOUT                                  | Faulty/irregular lot shape                                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Faulty/irregular lot configuration                        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Lack of access to a public street                         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Inadequate lot size                                       |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Other   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
| d.  | UNSANITARY OR UNSAFE CONDITIONS                    | Poorly lit or unlit areas                                 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Cracked or uneven surfaces for pedestrians                |   | • | • | • | • |   |   |   |   | •  | •  | •  | • |
|   |  | Poor drainage   |   | • |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | •  | •  |    |   |
|   |  | Insufficient grading or steep slopes                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Presence of trash and debris                              | • | • | • | • | • |   |   |   |   | •  | •  | •  | • |
|   |  | Abandoned/inoperable vehicles and equipment               |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | •  |    |   |
|   |  | Presence of potentially hazardous materials or conditions |   | • | • | • | • |   |   |   |   | •  |    | •  |   |
|   |  | Vagrants/vandalism/graffiti                               | • |   | • | • |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | • |
| Other (unsafe level changes/drop-offs/fire risk)                              |  |   | • | • |   |   |   |   |   | • |   |    |    |    |   |
| e.  | DETERIORATION OF SITE OR OTHER IMPROVEMENTS (SITE) | Deteriorated/lack of parking lot/site pavement            |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | •  |    | •  |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated/lack of site curb and gutter                 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated/lack of site sidewalks/pedestrian areas      |   |   |   | • |   |   |   |   |   | •  |    | •  |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated/lack of outdoor lighting                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated/substandard/lack of site utilities           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Deteriorated/lack of surface drainage facilities          |   | • |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | •  | •  | •  |   |
|   |  | Inadequate site maintenance                               | • | • | • | • |   | • |   |   |   | •  | •  | •  |   |
|   |  | Non-conformance to site development regulations           | • | • | • | • |   | • |   |   |   | •  | •  | •  |   |
|   |  | Deterioration of signage                                  |   |   |   |   | • |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |
|   |  | Other   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |

Note: This table summarizes Field Survey observations only.  
Source: DGC Consulting field survey and Google Earth



**Table 3-2: Photographic/Desktop Analysis Reference Sheet (cont'd)**

|     |   |   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |   |  |
|-----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|--|
| f.  | UNUSUAL TOPOGRAPHY OR INADEQUATE PUBLIC IMPROVEMENTS OR UTILITIES (ROW)   | Poor site grading   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Deteriorated/lack of street pavement in right-of-way        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | • | • |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Deteriorated/lack of curb and gutter in right-of-way        |   |   | • |   |   |   |   |   | • | •  |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Insufficient street lighting in right-of-way                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Overhead utilities in right-of-way                          |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Deteriorated/inadequate/lack of sidewalks in right-of-way   |   |   | • | • |   |   | • | • | • |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Deteriorated/unsafe utilities in the right-of-way           |   |   | • |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Other (trip/fall hazard, unprotected drop-offs)             |   |   | • | • |   | • | • | • |   |    |    |    |   |  |
| g.  | DEFECTIVE OR UNUSUAL TITLE CONDITIONS   | Title conditions making the property unmarketable           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Other (easements and other encumbrances)                    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | NOT SURVEYED  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
| h.  | THE EXISTENCE OF CONDITIONS THAT ENDANGER LIFE OR PROPERTY BY FIRE OR OTHER CAUSES  | Structures in the floodplain                                |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Evidence of previous fire                                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Inadequate emergency vehicle provisions                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Presence of dry debris adjacent to structures               | • | • |   | • |   |   | • |   |   |    | •  |    | • |  |
|     |   | Hazardous materials near structures/fire hazard             |   |   | • | • |   |   | • |   |   |    |    |    | • |  |
|     |   | Dead trees/shrubs near high traffic areas                   | • | • | • |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | • |  |
|     |   | Other (unsafe level changes: trip/fall hazard)              |   |   | • | • |   |   | • | • | • |    | •  |    |   |  |
| i.  | BUILDINGS THAT ARE UNSAFE / UNHEALTHY FOR PERSONS TO LIVE / WORK IN BECAUSE OF BUILDING CODE VIOLATIONS, DILAPIDATION, DETERIORATION, DEFECTIVE DESIGN, PHYSICAL CONSTRUCTION, OR FAULTY OR INADEQUATE FACILITIES | Building code violations                                    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Public health concerns                                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Dilapidated or deteriorated interior of building            |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Defective design or physical construction                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Faulty or inadequate facilities                             |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Presence of mold  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Inadequate emergency egress provisions                      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Evidence of recent flooding                                 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Unprotected electrical systems/wires/gas lines              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Inadequate fire suppression systems                         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Evidence of vagrants inside building                        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Other (fire hazard)   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | NOT SURVEYED  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
| j.  | ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION   | Official documentation of contamination                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Storage or evidence of hazardous materials                  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Other evidence of environmental contamination               |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | NOT SURVEYED  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
| k.5 | REQUIRES HIGH LEVELS OF MUNICIPAL SERVICES OR SITES/ BUILDINGS/ IMPROVEMENTS UNDERUTILIZED/ VACANT  | High levels of vacancy                                      |   |   | • | • |   | • |   |   |   |    |    | •  |   |  |
|     |   | High levels of municipal code violations                    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | High levels of vehicular accident reports                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | High levels of requests for emergency services              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Other evidence of required high level of municipal services |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |  |
|     |   | Other evidence of substantial physical underutilization     |   |   | • | • |   |   | • |   |   |    |    |    | • |  |

Note: This table summarizes Field Survey observations only.

Source: DGC Consulting field survey and Google Earth

## **Exhibit 3-2: Field Survey Photographs**



**Photo 1**



**Photo 5**



**Photo 9**



**Photo 2**



**Photo 6**



**Photo 10**



**Photo 3**



**Photo 7**



**Photo 11**



**Photo 4**



**Photo 8**



**Photo 12**

## Appendix A

### Sources Consulted

1. State of Colorado Statutes Urban Renewal Law § 31-25-101:  
[http://www.state.co.us/gov\\_dir/leg\\_dir/olls/colorado\\_revised\\_statutes.htm](http://www.state.co.us/gov_dir/leg_dir/olls/colorado_revised_statutes.htm)
2. Google Earth aerial mapping (2015)
3. Mapping and GIS imagery provided by City of Colorado Springs IT Department (2017)
4. El Paso County Assessor website (2017 values)
5. City of Colorado Springs website (2017)
6. Downtown Colorado Springs Market Assessment, Progressive Urban Management Associates, January 27, 2016.
7. Downtown Colorado Springs Form-Base Code, City of Colorado Springs, 2017
8. Imagine Downtown Colorado Springs Master Plan, City of Colorado Springs, not dated
9. City of Colorado Springs Fire Department Annual Report 2016 Statistical Abstract, March 26, 2016.