

---

---

# DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION REVIEW CRITERIA

---

---

## **MASTER PLAN REVIEW CRITERIA:**

### **7.5.408: REVIEW CRITERIA:**

Master plans and major and minor amendments to approved master plans shall be reviewed for substantial conformance with the criteria listed below. Minor amendments are not subject to review criteria in subsection F of this section.

- A. Comprehensive Plan: The Comprehensive Plan and the 2020 Land Use Map are the context and the benchmark for the assessment of individual land use master plans. The proposed land use master plan or the amendment conforms to the policies and strategies of the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed land use pattern is consistent with the Citywide perspective presented by the 2020 Land Use Map.
- B. Land Use Relationships:
  - 1. The master plan promotes a development pattern characterizing a mix of mutually supportive and integrated residential and nonresidential land uses with a network of interconnected streets and good pedestrian and bicycle connections.
  - 2. Activity centers are designed so they are compatible with, accessible from and serve as a benefit to the surrounding neighborhood or business area. Activity centers also vary in size, intensity, scale and types of uses depending on their function, location and surroundings.
  - 3. The land use pattern is compatible with existing and proposed adjacent land uses and protects residential neighborhoods from excessive noise and traffic infiltration.
  - 4. Housing types are distributed so as to provide a choice of densities, types and affordability.
  - 5. Land use types and location reflect the findings of the environmental analysis pertaining to physical characteristics which may preclude or limit development opportunities.
  - 6. Land uses are buffered, where needed, by open space and/or transitions in land use intensity.
  - 7. Land uses conform to the definitions contained in article 2, part 2 of this Zoning Code.
- C. Public Facilities:
  - 1. The land use master plan conforms to the most recently adopted Colorado Springs parks, recreation and trails master plan.
  - 2. Recreational and educational uses are sited and sized to conveniently service the proposed population of the master plan area and the larger community.
  - 3. The proposed school sites meet the location, function and size needs of the school district.
  - 4. The land use master plan conforms to the adopted plans and policies of Colorado Springs Utilities.
  - 5. Proposed public facilities are consistent with the strategic network of long range plans.
  - 6. The master development drainage plan conforms to the applicable drainage basin planning study and the drainage criteria manual.
- D. Transportation:
  - 1. The land use master plan is consistent with the adopted intermodal transportation plan. Conformity with the intermodal transportation plan is evidence of compliance with State and local air quality implementation and maintenance plans.
  - 2. The land use master plan has a logical hierarchy of arterial and collector streets with an emphasis on the reduction of through traffic in residential neighborhoods and improves connectivity, mobility choices and access to jobs, shopping and recreation.
  - 3. The design of the streets and multiuse trails minimizes the number of uncontrolled or at grade trail crossings of arterials and collectors.
  - 4. The transportation system is compatible with transit routes and allows for the extension of these routes.

---

---

## DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION REVIEW CRITERIA

---

---

5. The land use master plan provides opportunities or alternate transportation modes and cost effective provision of transit services to residents and businesses.
6. Anticipated trip generation does not exceed the capacity of existing or proposed major roads. If capacity is expected to be exceeded, necessary improvements will be identified, as will responsibility, if any, of the master plan for the construction and timing for its share of improvements.

### E. Environment:

1. The land use master plan preserves significant natural site features and view corridors. The Colorado Springs open space plan shall be consulted in identifying these features.
2. The land use master plan minimizes noise impacts on existing and proposed adjacent areas.
3. The land use master plan utilizes floodplains and drainageways as greenways for multiple uses including conveyance of runoff, wetlands, habitat, trails, recreational uses, utilities and access roads when feasible.
4. The land use master plan reflects the findings of a preliminary geologic hazard study and provides a range of mitigation techniques for the identified geologic, soil and other constrained natural hazard areas.

### F. Fiscal:

1. A fiscal impact analysis and existing infrastructure capacity and service levels are used as a basis for determining impacts attributable to the master plan. City costs related to infrastructure and service levels shall be determined for a ten (10) year time horizon for only the appropriate municipal funds.
2. The fiscal impact analysis demonstrates no adverse impact upon the general community and the phasing of the master plan is consistent with the adopted strategic network of long range plans that identify the infrastructure and service needs for public works, parks, police and fire services.
3. The cost of on site and off site master plan impacts on public facilities and services is not borne by the general community. In those situations where the master plan impacts are shown to exceed the capacity of existing public facilities and services, the applicant will demonstrate a means of increasing the capacity of the public facilities and services proportionate to the impact generated by the proposed master plan. Mitigation of on site and off site costs may include, but is not limited to, planned expansions to the facilities, amendments to the master plan, phasing of the master plan and/or special agreements related to construction and/or maintenance of infrastructure upgrades and/or service expansions. Any special agreements for mitigation of on site and off site impacts for public improvements, services and maintenance are shown to be workable and supported by financial assurances. Preexisting and/or anticipated capacity problems not attributable to the master plan shall be identified as part of the master plan review.
4. Special agreements for public improvements and maintenance are shown to be workable and are based on proportional need generated by the master plan.
5. Any proposed special districts are consistent with policies established by the City Council. (Ord. 84-221; Ord. 87-38; Ord. 91-30; Ord. 94-107; Ord. 97-109; Ord. 01-42; Ord. 02-51)