Huerfano County Comprehensive Planning Comments

- 1. Future Land Use Map: Missing some subdivisions. Key should be changed to read Existing subdivisions zoned residential.
 - 1. Key: existing subdivision (treated water capacity) should be changed to read public treated water system. Or, if it includes private systems, include those on map.
 - 2. p. 11 "As such, the FLUM does not encourage sprawling development patterns that rely on exempt wells." I'm not sure the map itself discourages this. Does "not encouraging sprawling development patterns" just mean not acknowledging all of the potential sprawl already in the parcel map in the form of large-acre subdivisions or largely vacant subdivisions like Rio Cucharas? Perhaps changing the language to read that the Comprehensive Plan doesn't encourage... rather than saying that it is the map that doesn't encourage...
- 2. Should Future Land Use Map identify certain large-acre subdivisions that should potentially be zoned homesteading in the future?
- 3. P. 10 Support Thriving Villages in Huerfano County
 - 1. "Future growth in Huerfano County that does not occur within Walsenburg and La Veta should be concentrated in village areas<u>and the wellness hub</u>, prioritizing infill development whenever possible"
 - 2. If future growth is to be concentrated in village areas, how do we address the vast number of vacant lots in mostly-vacant subdivisions like Rio Cucharas, where future growth might be more likely, even if less desirable?
 - 3. P. 13: Code of the West: Currently, our version of the Code of the West is included in the comprehensive plan. If we want to continue to use it, it should be included in this updated comprehensive plan. This plan only makes reference to the county having adopted it, but we have only adopted it as part of the current comprehensive plan. For this to be true, we need to keep the COTW in this update.
 - 1. Also mentioned on page 68. This might be a better place to insert it.
 - 4. P. 16: Add ZLU Policy 2.3: encourages lot consolidations?
 - 5. P. 16: ZLU 2.7: spelling identifies \rightarrow identify
 - 1. Pressure not being reduced on STRs, ... Reduce pressure on housing market created by STRs.
 - 6. P. 16: ZLU 2.8: spelling: meets \rightarrow meet
 - 7. P. 17: ZLU Action 3.1 (4): It is not our intention to get rid of Rural Residential, but to add Homesteading. Rural Residential and Urbanizing Residential zones should not be combined.
 - 8. P. 44: Action 5: Add seek funding to pave critical roads in Cuchara
 - 9. P. 45: "T Action 6.2: Consider revisions to the county's subdivision policy or regulations to assign a greater level of <u>road</u> maintenance responsibility to developers and / or property owners."
 - 10. P. 47 first bullet: spelling $pf \rightarrow of$
 - 11. P. 47 RT Goal 1: wrong use of "multi-generational" change to ...access by residents of all ages...
 - 12. P. 54: PSCS Policy 3.2: This is very vague and doesn't really describe a policy. If not made more specific, perhaps this should be moved to the introductory paragraph under "Accounting for Limited Water Supply."