



**DOUGLAS COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION
Tuesday, September 23, 2025 – 10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
(In Office)**

A G E N D A

**10:00 a.m. State Strategic Growth Legislation – Required Reporting Consideration Follow-up
Event Center Regulatory Amendment Request**

Agenda Item

Date: September 23, 2025

To: Douglas County Board of County Commissioners

Through: Douglas J. DeBord, County Manager

From: Terence T. Quinn, AICP, Director of Community Development *TQ*
Jennifer L. Eby, AICP, Director of Community Services *JE*

CC: DJ Beckwith, Principal Planner
Lauren Pulver, Planning Resources Supervisor
Kati Carter, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning Resources
Steven E. Koster, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning Services
Rand M. Clark, CCAP, NCRT, Assistant Director of Community Services

Subject: **State Strategic Growth Legislation – Required Reporting Consideration Follow-up**

SUMMARY

As follow-up to the August 12, 2025, work session regarding State Strategic Growth Legislation reporting requirements, attached are reports currently required for HB24-1153, Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) and HB24-1313, Housing in Transit-Oriented Communities (TOC).

DISCUSSION

The Board of County Commissioners (Board) also asked that staff provide an assessment of general compliance with the Legislation. The following is an overview of that assessment for the pertinent bills:

- **HB24-1153, Accessory Dwelling Units**
 - The County is compliant with the law.
- **HB24-1313, Housing in Transit-Oriented Communities**
 - The County's Housing Opportunity Goal (HOG) is 8,184 dwelling units. The County already has 3,326 existing units within its transit areas and has 681 more units approved for development in this area – for a total of 4,007 built or about to be built units. The maximum number of units supported by the current zoning is 6,210 units. To be in compliance with the bill by December 31, 2027, zoning to allow for the development of the total number of units (8,184) in the HOG must be established.
- **SB24-174, Sustainable Affordable Housing Assistance**
 - The BCC approved participation in the DRCOG Regional Housing Needs Assessment at the September 9 Business Meeting complying with SB24-174 regulations. Community

Services staff are working with the Douglas County Housing Partnership to complete the Housing Action Plan by the January 1, 2028, deadline.

Additional reporting is not required, nor are reporting requirements anticipated, for the following bills:

- HB24-1007, Prohibit Residential Occupancy Limits
- HB24-1304, Minimum Parking Requirements
- HB25-1273, Residential Building Stair Modernization
- SB25-002, Regional Building Codes for Factory-Built Structures

Staff will continue to monitor all the bills and keep the Board apprised of any new requirements that may develop as the bills are further implemented.

NEXT STEPS

Staff is prepared to discuss this further with the Board.

ATTACHMENTS

HB24-1153, Accessory Dwelling Units – Compliance Report

HB24-1313, Housing in Transit-Oriented Communities – Assessment Report

HB 24-1152 ADU Compliance Report

General Information

Who should complete this form?

Local government staff from jurisdictions that are subject to HB24-1152's requirements or that voluntarily wish to comply with the requirements as an ADU Supportive Jurisdiction (see the [HB24-1152 guidance](#) for a definition of ADU Supportive Jurisdiction and a list of Subject Jurisdictions).

What do I need to complete this form?

The following questions are informed by the statutory language of HB24-1152, as well as the interpretive guidance and tools published by DOLA to implement the law. To complete this, you will need to reference the ADU sections of your land use code either by providing a URL to the subject code, or uploading a Word or PDF file (final redline or a clean version is acceptable). Your code should include your ADU:

- Definition
- Relationship to Single-Unit Detached Dwellings
- Parcel exemptions (if any)
- Parking standards and exemptions (if any)
- Maximum and/or minimum size allowance
- Setbacks
- Minimum lot size
- Architectural design standards (if any)
- Allowance within PUD zone districts
- Owner occupancy statement (if any)
- Review process and review criteria for both outside of and within Historic Districts

An unapproved version of the code cannot be used. Jurisdictions should review the law and guidance prior to submitting this form: [Accessory Dwelling Units - Overview of HB24-1152](#)

What happens after I submit this form?

Once received, DOLA will review the reports for compliance with the statutory requirements for accuracy and completeness, and will then provide written notice to the jurisdiction approving or requesting revisions and providing feedback within 90 days of the report's submittal date. DOLA welcomes jurisdictions to submit draft reports early to staff by email for a courtesy review and feedback.

If revisions are requested, DOLA may grant an additional 120 days to correct deficiencies and resubmit. The amended report shall be reviewed and approved, or rejected within 90 days.

When is this form due?

June 30, 2025. This is a one-time compliance report and is not recurring.

Who should I contact if I have questions?

Hannah Van Nimwegen

hannah.vannimwegen@state.co.us

Submitter Name (First, Last)

Steve Koster

Submitter Role

Assistant Director of Planning Services

Submitter Email

skoster@douglas.co.us

Submitter Jurisdiction

Douglas County

Your ADU Code

Please upload or provide a link to your Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) development code, including any referenced attachments, tables and related code sections as necessary for compliance review. The uploaded/linked code should include your ADU:

- Definition
- Relationship to Single-Unit Detached Dwellings
- Parcel exemptions (if any)
- Parking standards and exemptions (if any)
- Maximum and/or minimum size allowance
- Setbacks
- Minimum lot size
- Architectural design standards (if any)
- Allowance within PUD zone districts
- Owner occupancy statement (if any)
- Review process and review criteria for both outside of and within Historic Districts

ADU code file upload(s)

DC Zoning Resolution, Section 1, Administrative Provisions and Procedures
DC Zoning Resolution, Section 3, Agriculture
DC Zoning Resolution, Section 36, Definitions

Upload up to 5 supported files. Max 100MB per file. (MS Word or PDF only)
(Multi-file upload, max 5 files, max 100MB per file, only accept .doc, .docx, or .pdf extensions)

Current code URL reference

URL

Add URLs separated by commas

ADU Definitions and Exemptions

This information is being submitted to ensure your code is in compliance with the law and guidance with regards to ADU definitions and exemptions. For more info, see [Accessory Dwelling Units - Overview of HB24-1152](#).

Where in your code is an Accessory Dwelling Unit defined?

See “[Key Terms](#)” on the DOLA webpage for more information on the definition of an ADU in HB24-1152.

Section 36 of the Douglas County Zoning Resolution (“DCZR”). Note: while the code does define Accessory Dwelling Unit, that definition is only relevant in the limited areas within the Highlands Ranch Census Designated Place (the “HRCDP”) outside of any Planned Unit Developments (“PUDs”). In the PUDs, the statutory prohibition on enforcement of restrictions on the creation of an accessory dwelling unit as an accessory use to any single-unit detached dwelling unit in any way that is prohibited by section 29-35-403, C.R.S. governs. Section 1, Subsection 124 of the DCZR addresses compliance with state statutes by stating, in relevant part, “To the extent any provision of this Resolution or any provision of a planned development is inconsistent with any federal or state legal requirement (a “Controlling Legal Requirement”), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement. To the extent any Controlling Legal Requirement, when properly interpreted, would create additional requirements (e.g. reasonable accommodations or waiver of otherwise valid provisions), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement.”

Add code section references and/or comments to cite your ADU definition.

Does your code describe or define an 'exempt parcel' from the ADU standards?

See “[Key Terms](#)” on the DOLA webpage for more information on the definition of Exempt Parcels in HB24-1152.

Yes

No

If yes, where are these reflected in your code?

N/A

Add code section references and/or comments to cite your exempt parcel language.

(Optional) Additional comments for ADU Definition and Exemptions section:

No additional comments.

This text box is completely optional. Feel free to add any comments here if you think it will help the reviewers understand your jurisdiction's ADU definition and exemptions.

Allowed Use, Administrative Approval, Objective Standards

This information is being submitted to ensure your code is in compliance with the law and guidance with regards to allowed use, administrative approval, and objective standards. For more info, see [Accessory Dwelling Units - Overview of HB24-1152](#).

Does your code allow ADUs as an allowed or accessory use to Single-Unit Detached Dwellings everywhere Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed?

Yes

No

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code?

Douglas County is only a “subject jurisdiction” in relation to the HRCDP. As discussed previously, within the HRCDP, the DCZR does allow ADUs as an accessory use to Single-Unit Detached Dwellings everywhere Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed. Outside of the HRCDP, many of the PUDs do not allow ADUs in all of the areas where Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed. There are limited areas in the HRCDP zoned Agricultural One (“A-1”) where Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed. ADUs are allowed as an accessory use in the A-1 zone district. There are no other zone districts present in the HRCDP where Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed.

Add code section references and/or comments to cite where ADUs are permitted or accessory to a Single-Unit Detached Dwelling.

Does your code allow ADUs as an allowed or accessory use to Single-Unit Detached Dwellings in Planned Unit Developments where Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed?

Yes

No

Not applicable

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code? (Or please provide other evidence of compliance.)

Per C.R.S 24-67-106(5.3)(b), any PUD in the HRCDP shall not be interpreted or enforced to restrict the creation of an accessory dwelling unit as an accessory use to any single-unit detached dwelling unit in any way that is prohibited by section 29-35-403. Section 1, Subsection 124 of the DCZR addresses compliance with state statutes by stating, in relevant part, “To the extent any provision of this Resolution or any provision of a planned development is inconsistent with any federal or state legal requirement (a “Controlling Legal Requirement”), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement. To the extent any Controlling Legal Requirement, when properly interpreted, would create additional requirements (e.g. reasonable accommodations or waiver of otherwise valid provisions), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement.” Outside of the HRCDP, many of the PUDs do not allow ADUs in all of the areas where Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed.

Add code section references and/or comments.

Are ADU development proposals in areas where Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are an allowed use (except properties in Historic Districts, if applicable) approved, approved with conditions, or denied through an Administrative Approval Process?

See “[Key Terms](#)” on the DOLA webpage for more information on the definition of an Administrative Approval Process in HB24-1152.

Yes

No

If so, is this reflected in your code?

There is no “Administrative Approval Process” required for ADUs. A building permit application comes in and gets reviewed for compliance with the relevant zone district development standards (setbacks, height, water, sewer). The approval comes through the issuance of the building permit.

Add code section references and/or comments.

Are all standards and criteria for an ADU in your code compliant with the law's definition of Objective Standards?

See "[Key Terms](#)" on the DOLA webpage for more information on the definition of Objective Standards in HB24-1152.

Yes

No

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code?

The DCZR does not contain standards and criteria specific to ADUs; ADUs are simply one of many allowed accessory uses. As discussed previously, per C.R.S 24-67-106(5.3)(b), any PUD in the HRCDP shall not be interpreted or enforced to restrict the creation of an accessory dwelling unit as an accessory use to any single-unit detached dwelling unit in any way that is prohibited by section 29-35-403. Section 1, Subsection 124 of the DCZR addresses compliance with state statutes by stating, in relevant part, "To the extent any provision of this Resolution or any provision of a planned development is inconsistent with any federal or state legal requirement (a "Controlling Legal Requirement"), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement. To the extent any Controlling Legal Requirement, when properly interpreted, would create additional requirements (e.g. reasonable accommodations or waiver of otherwise valid provisions), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement."

There are limited areas in the HRCDP zoned Agricultural One ("A-1") where Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed. ADUs are allowed as an accessory use in the A-1 zone district (DCZR, Section 3).

Add code section references and/or comments to cite an ADU's development standards, and/or an application's (if applicable) review criteria.

If your jurisdiction has Historic Districts, does the approval process for ADUs within your code meet the requirements of the law?

The law states that jurisdictions may subject ADUs for Single-Unit Detached Dwellings in Historic Districts to public hearing requirements and other rules as required of other development proposals in Historic District properties. For example, the law allows an appointed historic preservation commission to make a decision or recommendation to local administrative staff.

Yes

No

Jurisdiction does not have Historic Districts

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code?

N/A

Add code section references and/or comments to cite the process for reviewing an ADU within a Historic District.

(Optional) Additional comments for Allowed Use, Administrative Approval, Objectives Standards section:

No additional comments

This text box is completely optional. Feel free to add any comments here if you think it will help the reviewers understand your jurisdiction's answers in this section.
(Long text)

Parking

This information is being submitted to ensure your code is in compliance with the law and guidance with regards to ADU parking. For more info, see [Accessory Dwelling Units - Overview of HB24-1152](#).

Does your code allow ADUs to be constructed or converted without requiring off-street parking spaces?

Yes

No

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code?

N/A

Add code section references and/or comments.

The law allows for a jurisdiction to require new off-street parking spaces for ADUs in certain circumstances. Does your code have an exception allowing a parking space be required for an ADU?

See the “Parking Regulations” section within the [Land Use & Development Code Guidance](#) on the DOLA webpage for more information on allowed exceptions to the parking requirements in HB24-1152.

Yes

No

If so, where are these reflected in your code?

N/A

Add code section references and/or comments to cite any exceptions to the parking requirement for an ADU.

(Optional) Additional comments for Parking section:

No additional comments.

This text box is completely optional. Feel free to add any comments here if you think it will help the reviewers understand your jurisdiction’s answers in this section.

Owner Occupancy

This information is being submitted to ensure your code is in compliance with the law and guidance with regards to owner occupancy. For more info, see [Accessory Dwelling Units - Overview of HB24-1152](#).

Do you confirm your jurisdiction does not require owner occupancy of the ADU or the Single-Unit Detached Dwelling?

See the “Owner occupancy on lots with ADUs” section within the [Land Use & Development Code Guidance](#) on the DOLA webpage for more information on allowed exceptions to the owner occupancy requirements in HB24-1152.

Yes

No

If you use the allowed exception that evidence of owner occupancy is required only at the time of application for a building permit for an ADU and/or for license or permit allowing Short-Term Rental of the ADU, where in your code do you document this exception?

N/A

See the “Owner occupancy on lots with ADUs” section within the [Land Use & Development Code Guidance](#) on the DOLA webpage for more information on allowed exceptions to the owner occupancy requirements in HB24-1152. Enter N/A here if not applicable, or add code section references and/or comments to cite the exception in your code.

(Optional) Additional comments for Owner Occupancy section:

No additional comments.

This text box is completely optional. Feel free to add any comments here if you think it will help the reviewers understand your jurisdiction’s answers in this section.

Size, Dimension, and Design Standards

This information is being submitted to ensure your code is in compliance with the law and guidance with regards to size, dimension, and design standards. For more info, see [Accessory Dwelling Units - Overview of HB24-1152](#).

Does your code allow a minimum right to a 750 square foot ADU (unless that’s larger than the primary structure) and have a minimum ADU size that’s 500 square feet or less?

Yes

No

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code?

The DCZR does not establish minimum or maximum sizes for ADUs

Add code section references and/or comments to cite any size minimums or maximums for ADUs.

Are the required side setbacks for ADUs no larger than those required for primary dwelling units in the same zoning district?

Yes

No

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code?

The DCZR does not contain standards and criteria specific to ADUs; ADUs are simply one of many allowed accessory uses. As discussed previously, per C.R.S 24-67-106(5.3)(b), any PUD in the HRCDP shall not be interpreted or enforced to restrict the creation of an accessory dwelling unit as an accessory use to any single-unit detached dwelling unit in any way that is prohibited by section 29-35-403. Section 1, Subsection 124 of the DCZR addresses compliance with state statutes by stating, in relevant part, “To the extent any provision of this Resolution or any provision of a planned development is inconsistent with any federal or state legal requirement (a “Controlling Legal Requirement”), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement. To the extent any Controlling Legal Requirement, when properly interpreted, would create additional requirements (e.g. reasonable accommodations or waiver of otherwise valid provisions), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement.”

There are limited areas in the HRCDP zoned Agricultural One (“A-1”), where Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed. ADUs are allowed as an accessory use in the A-1 zone district. In the A-1 zone district, the side setback for accessory uses is less than or equal to the side setback for primary dwelling units (DCZR, Section 3).

Add code section references and/or comments to cite the applicable side setbacks for ADUs.

Are the required rear setbacks for ADUs no greater than those required for other accessory building types in the same zoning district OR five feet?

Yes

No

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code?

The DCZR does not contain standards and criteria specific to ADUs; ADUs are simply one of many allowed accessory uses. As discussed previously, per C.R.S 24-67-106(5.3)(b), any PUD in the HRCDP shall not be interpreted or enforced to restrict the creation of an accessory dwelling unit as an accessory use to any single-unit detached dwelling unit in any way that is prohibited by section 29-35-403. Section 1, Subsection 124 of the DCZR addresses compliance with state statutes by stating, in relevant part, “To the extent any provision of this Resolution or any provision of a planned development is inconsistent with any federal or state legal requirement (a “Controlling Legal Requirement”), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement. To the extent any Controlling Legal Requirement, when properly interpreted, would create additional requirements (e.g. reasonable accommodations or waiver of otherwise valid provisions), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement.”

There are limited areas in the HRCDP zoned A-1, where Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed. ADUs are allowed as an accessory use in the A-1 zone district. In the A-1 zone district, the rear setback for accessory uses is less than or equal to the rear setback for primary dwelling units (DCZR, Section 3).

Add code section references and/or comments to cite the applicable rear setbacks for ADUs.

Is the minimum lot size for ADUs no more than what is required for Single-Unit Detached Dwellings in the same zoning district?

Yes

No

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code?

The DCZR does not contain standards and criteria specific to ADUs; ADUs are simply one of many allowed accessory uses. As discussed previously, per C.R.S 24-67-106(5.3)(b), any PUD in the HRCDP shall not be interpreted or enforced to restrict the creation of an accessory dwelling unit as an accessory use to any single-unit detached dwelling unit in any way that is prohibited by section 29-35-403. Section 1, Subsection 124 of the DCZR addresses compliance with state statutes by stating, in relevant part, “To the extent any provision of this Resolution or any provision of a planned development is inconsistent with any federal or state legal requirement (a “Controlling Legal Requirement”), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement. To the extent any Controlling Legal Requirement, when properly interpreted, would create additional requirements (e.g. reasonable accommodations or waiver of otherwise valid provisions), then this Resolution, and any provision of any planned development, are intended to be and shall be interpreted to be consistent with such Controlling Legal Requirement.”

There are limited areas in the HRCDP zoned A-1, where Single-Unit Detached Dwellings are allowed. ADUs are allowed as an accessory use in the A-1 zone district. The A-1 zone district does have minimum lot sizes of 2 acres for lots that are on well and septic systems and 1 acre for lots that are on central water and septic systems. However, as with PUDs in the HRCDP, Section 1, Subsection 124 of the DCZR, which addresses compliance with state statutes, is applicable to the A-1 zone district. Therefore, the minimum lot sizes for ADUs set by the A-1 zone district are not applicable within the HRCDP (DCZR, Section 3).

Add code section references and/or comments.

Does your code, or any other ordinances or guidelines, mandate any architectural style, building material, or landscaping requirements for ADUs that are more restrictive than for Single-Unit Detached Dwellings in the same zoning district? This does not include Historic Districts.

Yes

No

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code?

N/A

Add code section references and/or comments.

Does your code mandate any aesthetic design and/or dimensional standards for factory-built ADUs that are beyond what is required for other types of ADUs?

Yes

No

If so, how and where is this reflected in your code?

N/A

Add code section references and/or comments.

(Optional) Additional comments for Size, Dimension, and Design Standards section:

No additional comments

This text box is completely optional. Feel free to add any comments here if you think it will help the reviewers understand your jurisdiction's answers in this section.

Final Certification

I certify that the answers provided in this form are accurate, complete, and up to date.

- I certify that the answers provided in this form are accurate, complete, and up to date.

Print Name

Steve Koster

Signature (Retype Full Name)

Steve Koster

HB 24-1313 TOC Preliminary Transit-Oriented Community Assessment

General Information

Who should complete this form?

HB24-1313 directs Transit-Oriented Communities to submit a Preliminary Transit-Oriented Community Assessment. For a list of Transit-Oriented Communities and guidance on HB24-1313, please visit [DOLA's webpage on Transit-Oriented Communities](#).

What do I need to complete this form?

There are two required elements of this report, as well as a third optional element (C.R.S. 29-35-204(3)):

1. Jurisdictions should carefully review [Section 3.1](#) of this Guidance and the Housing Opportunity Goal Calculation Tool User Guide in [Appendix A](#) prior to completing this section of the report. The preferred format for determining Exempt Parcels and calculating the Housing Opportunity Goal using the HOG Calculation Tool includes submitting:

1a. The HOG Calculation Tool with all “required where applicable” fields filled in.

1b. GIS layer used of parcels with exemptions marked and field names that match the HOG Calculation tool. If the field names do not match the fields in the HOG Calculation tool, a data dictionary should be provided explaining what each field is. Jurisdictions may use DOLA’s provided parcel dataset or their county assessors office. Jurisdictions must include all parcels in their Transit Areas and also ensure no parcels are overlapping (e.g. for condos).

1c. Best available data used to identify exemptions, such as a link to or copy of GIS layers for each exemption utilized with any explanation needed for what it contains and its source. If data is not available in GIS, please submit tabular data, a static map, or the best available data source.

2. (Required) The jurisdiction’s existing zoning map, with at the jurisdiction’s discretion, optional identification of any zoning districts that may qualify as Transit Centers, and links to the zoning standards for those districts (if the jurisdiction believes that any zoning districts may be applicable to this criteria).

3. (Optional) Affordability or anti-displacement strategies that have been implemented thus far.

Jurisdictions who are ready to submit the final Housing Opportunity Goal report for HB24-1313, which will also include a calculation of Zoning Capacity within Transit Centers, may do so in lieu of this Preliminary TOC Assessment report since the final report contains more complete versions of all of the same elements. DOLA is in the process of developing a draft template for the final HOG report, so jurisdictions in this position are encouraged to reach out to DOLA to discuss.

What happens after I submit this form?

DOLA staff will review jurisdictions' preliminary Transit-Oriented Community assessment reports submitted by a Transit-Oriented Community within 90 days and either provide written notice approving the report or provide direction for amending and resubmitting the report.

When is this form due?

June 30, 2025

Who should I reach out to if I have questions?

Kyle Sohner

kyle.sohner@state.co.us

Submitter Name (First, Last)

Steve Koster

Submitter Role

Assistant Director of Planning Services

Submitter Email

Skoster@douglas.co.us

Submitter Jurisdiction

Douglas County

Housing Opportunity Goal Calculation

HB24-1313 requires jurisdictions to determine which parcels are exempted from their Housing Opportunity Goal, and then calculate their Housing Opportunity Goal. Jurisdictions should review [Section 3.1](#) of the Guidance, which describes the preferred and alternative options for calculating and submitting evidence for the Housing Opportunity Goal, and the Housing Opportunity Goal Calculation Tool User Guide in [Appendix A](#).

DOLA has created a Housing Opportunity Goal Calculation Tool (“HOG Calculation Tool”) to help jurisdictions accurately identify their Exempt Parcels, and strongly prefers that jurisdictions utilize that tool.

Jurisdictions not using the HOG Calculation Tool must submit information and accompanying data that follows the guidance in [Section 3.1](#) regarding the “alternative calculation option”, is clearly documented and comparable to the information needed for the preferred format, and must describe the methods used to create their calculation. DOLA also reserves the right to request additional information if needed to determine accuracy and compliance.

Did you use the HOG calculation tool to calculate your Housing Opportunity Goal?

Yes

Yes with modifications

No

Please explain any differences in approach:

None.

Upload HOG Calculation Tool spreadsheet with all ‘required where applicable’ fields filled in:

N/A

Upload .xlsx. Max file size 100MB.

Parcel dataset source (Required):

☐ County assessor

☒ **DOLA dataset**

☐ Other

(Multiple choice, can select more than one)

Other parcel dataset source:

None.

Upload parcel data used to identify exempt and eligible acreage, and data dictionary (description of each field). If the field names do not match the fields in the HOG Calculation tool, a data dictionary should also be provided explaining what each field is. Parcel files can be clipped to the TOC area for faster upload speeds.

N/A

Upload GIS file with all relevant fields noted in the metadata or accompanying data dictionary. (.zip, .shp, .gdb, .kml files accepted. Max file size: 225MB)

Upload data for each exemption utilized, if not available at a link that can be included in the tool:

N/A

Please provide in one zip file, with each source clearly labeled (e.g. jurisdiction_floodplains.shp. Max file size: 225MB)

Reason for not using the HOG calculation tool:

N/A

Total Transit Area acreage:

461

Total acreage of Exempt Parcels:

256.4

Total acreage of parcels eligible for the HOG calculation:

204.6

Calculated Housing Opportunity Goal:

8,184

Describe methods used to calculate the Housing Opportunity Goal, including how they comply with the statutory requirements and the interpretive guidance published by DOLA in [Section 3.1](#). If applicable, please upload a spreadsheet or any other supporting analysis to demonstrate the methods described.

Douglas County utilized the DOLA Housing Opportunity Goal Calculation Tool and DOLA parcel data to complete the Tool.

N/A

Excel files only

Is the number of units of zoning capacity submitted as the Housing Opportunity Goal for your jurisdiction the final number and ready for DOLA approval? (Note: The selection of **Not Final** indicates your jurisdiction anticipates updating the calculation before or as part of the Final Housing Opportunity Goal Report due by December 31, 2026.)

Final

Not Final

Please note: HOG calculations submitted as part of this report may be preliminary, and may be updated later. Additionally, if you mark that this information is final, but identify something that should be corrected later, you may still submit updated information prior to or as part of the Final HOG Report on or before December 31, 2026.

Preliminary Transit Centers

The second item required by the Preliminary Transit-Oriented Communities Assessment Report is a map (or maps) of existing zoning districts that may qualify as Transit Centers along with preliminary evidence for this qualification (see [Sections 3.2-3.4 of the guidance](#) for details regarding criteria for Transit Centers). Note that it is not required that

jurisdictions be certain that a zoning district has standards that qualify areas as a Transit Center, nor is it required that any calculations of Zoning Capacity be undertaken at this step. This preliminary report is simply intended to provide an opportunity for conversation between jurisdictions and DOLA about potential opportunities within existing zoning districts.

The following items are needed for this section of the report:

1. **(Required)** Map(s) of the jurisdiction's existing zoning districts in the form of a weblink, a PDF, or GIS files.
2. **(Required)** Identification of any zoning districts that may currently have standards that allow them to qualify as Transit Centers, if applicable. Note that a jurisdiction may choose not to identify any zoning districts, if this analysis has not yet been performed.
3. **(Optional)** Links to or upload of the jurisdiction's zoning code standards for the zoning districts identified in #2 above.

Please upload or provide a link to a map or GIS file of existing zoning districts within the transit-oriented community:

URL Link

File Upload

Zip files only

Please list any zoning districts that may include potentially qualifying Transit Centers. If the jurisdiction has not yet identified any zoning districts, please write “none identified yet”:

None identified yet.

(Optional) For the Zoning Districts listed above, provide any "preliminary evidence" that the zoning districts may include potentially qualifying Transit Centers:

URL Link

File Upload

This information is not required, and is intended only to encourage conversation and collaboration if the jurisdiction has performed any analysis and would like to share with DOLA. This may include links to or uploads of zoning code information, narrative explanation, or other information as determined by the jurisdiction

Affordability and Displacement Mitigation Strategies (Optional)

Jurisdictions may, at their option, submit any affordability or displacement mitigation strategies that have been implemented to date. Please provide:

- A description of each strategy, when it was implemented, and any links or program documents, from the lists in statute (detailed in [Appendix F](#) of the guidance document).
- If the jurisdiction wishes to propose an alternative affordability or displacement mitigation strategy to those listed in statute, a description of the proposed strategy and how it would support equal or greater affordability or displacement mitigation support.

(Optional) Which [affordability strategies](#) is your jurisdiction already implementing? Please click the link for a description of each strategy. Please select any/all that apply:

- | |
|---|
| • <i>Inclusionary Zoning Ordinance</i> |
| • <i>Leveraging Publicly Owned Land</i> |
| • <i>Subsidizing/Reducing Fees</i> |
| • <i>Density Bonus Program</i> |
| • <i>Expedited Approval Process</i> |
| • <i>Accessible and Viable Units</i> |
| • <i>Housing for Families</i> |
| • <i>Reduced Parking Requirements</i> |
| • <i>Dedicated Revenue Source</i> |
| • <i>Short-Term Rental Regulations</i> |
| • <i>Prop 123 Commitment</i> |
| • <i>Multi-Family By Right</i> |

- *Administrative Review for Housing*
- *Land Banking/Community Land Trust*
- *Homeownership Strategies*

(Optional) Which [displacement mitigation strategies](#) is your jurisdiction implementing? Please click the link for a description of each strategy. Please select any/all that apply:

- *Community Land Trusts*
- *Affordable Housing Preservation*
- *Homestead Tax Exemptions*
- *Community Benefits Agreements*
- *Not Net Loss of Affordable Units*
- *Small Business Strategies*

(Optional) Please describe any affordability or displacement mitigation strategies your jurisdiction is implementing from the lists in statute, replicated in [Appendix F](#) in the TOC Guidance. If no affordability or displacement mitigation strategies have yet been analyzed or identified, this is allowable and may be noted below.

Please provide a description of each strategy, when it was implemented, and any links or program documents, from the lists in statute.

N/A

File Upload

(Optional) Please describe any alternative affordability or displacement mitigation strategies your jurisdiction would like to propose:

N/A

File Upload

Final Certification

I certify that the answers provided in this form are accurate, complete, and up to date.

- I certify that the answers provided in this form are accurate, complete, and up to date.

Print Name

Enter your full name

Signature (Retype Full Name)

Enter your full name

Agenda Item

Date: September 23, 2025

To: Douglas County Board of County Commissioners

Through: Douglas J. DeBord, County Manager

From: Terence T. Quinn, AICP, Director of Community Development *TQ*

CC: Jeanette Bare, AICP, Planning Manager
Kati Carter, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning Resources
Steven E. Koster, AICP, Assistant Director of Planning Services

Subject: **Event Center Regulatory Amendment Request**

SUMMARY

A County-registered citizen's group, Cherry Valley Community Action (CVCA), is requesting that the County consider changes to the Event Center regulations. Specifically, the group requests that the minimum parcel size for Event Centers allowed in the A-1 zone district be increased from 35 acres to 80 acres. In addition, CVCA requests that the Board of County Commissioners (Board) restrict its authority to reduce setbacks within the USR section of the Zoning Resolution to those uses proposed on roadways with posted speed limits of less than 55 mph. The request includes supporting arguments for these changes.

BACKGROUND

Until 2015, the Douglas County Zoning Resolution did not allow commercial Event Centers in its rural zone districts. Event Centers were allowed only in business and commercial zone districts and similar zone districts within Planned Developments. The Board directed staff to develop regulations to provide property owners with an opportunity to legally establish events centers on A-1 zoned parcels. A tiered framework was adopted with the required process tied to parcel size: 35 acres – 79.99 acres require a Use by Special Review (USR), 80 acres or more require a Site Improvement Plan, and 160 acres require an administrative certificate.

DISCUSSION

The following is an initial discussion of the proposed CVCA request:

Too many event centers. Since adoption of the regulations, six event centers have been approved, one on a 35-acre parcel, one on an 80-acre parcel, and four on parcels of greater than 160 acres with principal agricultural uses. There have been approximately 10 presubmittal meetings for different properties that have not resulted in formal applications.

Minimum acreage. When the event center regulations were approved, the Board desired to provide an opportunity for owners of 35-acre properties to propose event center uses. As with

other agritourism endeavors, such uses can provide owners with additional income while preserving the remaining portion of their properties in agricultural use.

Event Centers on 35-to-79.99-acre parcels are subject to USR approval. The USR process provides for a high level of public review, including noticed public hearings before the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners. Approval standards are comprehensive in nature and include a demonstration of neighborhood compatibility, appropriate scale and intensity of use, adequate buffering and screening, availability of services, and mitigation of noise and other impacts. Each 35-acre property and proposal is unique, and the USR process allows for consideration of a variety of factors: placement and design of structures, the number and size of events, site topography and vegetation, surrounding land uses, access, and available services. The applicant is given an opportunity to scale the intensity of its operations and define mitigation measures to achieve neighborhood compatibility. Increasing the minimum property size to 80 acres would not change the overall review process, and depending on site characteristics, might not result in event center proposals that are significantly different in appearance and impact.

Road speed and setbacks. Within the Douglas County Zoning Resolution (DCZR), street setbacks are based on the classification of the abutting roadway. Per Engineering criteria, roads themselves are specifically designed with adequate clear zones to minimize passenger fatalities related to collisions with elements next to the travel lanes. Zoning setbacks are principally intended to provide opportunities for future right-of-way or utility improvements, separation between uses, and consistency in neighborhood appearance. Through the development review process, Engineering evaluates clear zones, sight-distance triangles, and required transportation improvements to ensure traffic can safely enter and exit the venue.

Flexibility to consider lesser setbacks. The Board's authority to approve lesser setbacks through the USR process is defined in Section 2106.01 which states that: "The Board may establish lesser setbacks than those required in this Section, and heights greater than those allowed in the underlying zone district, if the Board determines that adequate buffering is or will be provided to mitigate such concerns as noise, visual, dust, or other social or environmental impacts. The burden of proof is on the applicant to demonstrate such adequate mitigation measures." This provision applies to many types of uses defined in Section 21 where specific minimum setbacks are established.

Section 21 requires that structures, outdoor assembly areas, and parking lots used for event centers are setback a minimum of 200 feet from all property lines. Lesser setback requests could result from situations where site topography or parcel configuration limit useable area, or where existing structures proposed for events do not meet the 200-foot setback. As 2106.01 states, it is up to the applicant to propose mitigation measures to off-set any impacts that might result from the setback reduction. Each site and proposal is different, and one size does not fit all when looking at placement of structures and use areas. Restricting the Board's ability to vary setbacks would reduce applicant and Board flexibility.

ATTACHMENTS

CVCA Request Letter

March 2025

On behalf of Cherry Valley residents, who primarily live in the A1 zone district in Franktown, Cherry Valley Community Action is requesting that:

- 1) Event Centers in the A1 zone district not be permitted on parcels of less than 80 acres (DCZR Section 3).
- 2) The Board of County Commissioner's (BOCC) authority to reduce the setback for uses allowed under the Use by Special Review (USR) process be restricted to roadways with posted speed limits of less than 55 mph (DCZR 2106.01).

Rationale – Request 1:

Event centers are extremely disruptive, unharmonious uses in the A-1 zone district. Less than 80 acres is insufficient to provide the necessary buffer required for operation without negative impact to the neighborhood. The A-1 district is characterized by vast open spaces with few trees. As such, views are expansive, and noise carries for miles throughout the neighborhood. Thus, screening of event center use and containing event center noise on small acreage parcels is not possible.

Traditionally, Douglas County has not allowed event centers on less than 80 acres. A 2015 Douglas County Zoning Resolution (DCZR) amendment allowed for them under the USR process. While the amendment was well-intentioned, in practice it has reduced the quality of life of residents in the A1 zone district.

Restricting event centers to parcels of 80 acres or more would remove the permitting of them on parcels of less than 80 acres through the USR process. This would allow the DCZR to be more fairly applied to all residents as it would reduce opportunities for subjective decisions in the application of our county laws.

Removing the USR process for permitting event centers on parcels of less than 80 acres would improve efficiency and reduce the cost of county government.

Douglas County does not have a shortage of event centers available to the public. Restricting event centers to 80+ acre parcels would not have a detrimental impact on the community.

Rationale – Request 2:

Limiting setback reductions to highways under 55 mph modernizes the USR process to account for the high speeds of vehicles on our paved highways, thus increasing the safety of residents and business patrons. Vehicle stopping distance at 55 mph is over 200 feet and at 65 mph is over 300 feet, which makes upholding roadway setbacks for USR applications extremely important.

In 2022 the BOCC approved a nearly 75% setback reduction for an event center on 35 acres on Highway 83, which has a posted speed limit of 65 mph that is often exceeded. A majority of event center activities will occur within the 200 foot setback with the closest building less than 58 feet from a state highway. This puts patrons and staff at risk of injury or death. Amending the DCZR to avoid this situation in the future is needed to ensure public safety.