



Magellan Strategies

City of Castle Pines Annexation Policy Survey Topline Results

Magellan Strategies is pleased to present the topline results of an online community survey of 614 adult residents in the City of Castle Pines, Colorado. The interviews were conducted from May 18th – June 14th, 2026. This survey has a margin of error of +/- 3.86% at the 95 percent confidence interval.

T1. Please confirm that you are a resident of the City of Castle Pines.

Yes100%

T2. What is your comfort level with expanding the city limits?

Total Comfortable.....24%

Total Uncomfortable59%

Neutral/Unsure17%

Very Comfortable.....10%

Somewhat Comfortable14%

Very Uncomfortable.....33%

Somewhat Uncomfortable26%

T3. Should the City consider annexation only when the property directly borders the current city limits?

Yes, only contiguous should be considered61%

Mostly yes, but exceptions may be appropriate26%

No, non-contiguous may be appropriate7%

Unsure6%

T4. A “flagpole annexation” uses a narrow strip of land—usually a street or right-of-way—to connect a larger property to the City boundary for annexation. When, if ever, should the City consider a flagpole annexation? *Please select all that apply.*

To preserve open space or trails57%
Only if annexation has strong connection to City....29%
To support a major public benefit28%
To improve infrastructure/transportation.....26%
To allow commercial/employment development....10%
To allow residential development.....6%

City should not consider flagpole annexations33%

Land Use Priorities

T5. What types of land uses would you be open to if the City would annex a property?
Please select up to three.

Open space or conservation areas.....74%
Parks, recreation, or trail areas72%
Commercial retail or restaurants.....23%
Low-density residential17%
Mix of residential and commercial uses13%
Civic or public facilities9%
Office or employment centers4%
Medium-density residential.....3%
Higher-density residential0.2%

I do not support annexation for new development..22%

T6. How supportive would you be of annexation for:

	Total Supportive	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Somewhat Opposed	Strongly Opposed	Neutral/Unsure
Primarily commercial development, such as retail, restaurants, or services	40%	16%	24%	14%	32%	14%
Employment-generating uses, such as offices, medical, or business campuses?	28%	7%	21%	20%	38%	14%
Primarily residential development	18%	5%	13%	20%	47%	15%
Uses such as light industrial development (e.g., manufacturing, auto body, etc.)?	7%	2%	5%	17%	69%	7%

T7. Should the City prioritize annexations that include a mix of uses, such as housing, commercial, parks, and civic spaces?

Depends on location and design44%
No37%
Yes16%
Unsure3%

Density and Development Character

T8. How important is residential density when evaluating a potential annexation?

Very and Somewhat Important Combined.....91%

Very Important78%
Somewhat Important.....13%
Not Important at All3%
Not Very Important1%
Neutral5%

T9. What level of residential density would you generally support in newly annexed areas?

Low density, similar to existing neighborhoods24%
Very low density, such as large-lot homes.....19%
It depends on the location and project design10%
Moderate - smaller lots/townhomes/duplexes5%
Higher density, apartments or mixed-use housing....1%

I do not support residential annexation40%
Unsure1%

T10. Should higher-density housing be considered if it helps support walkability, commercial areas, affordability, or public amenities?

No61%
Maybe, depending on the location.....30%
Yes8%
Unsure1%

T11. How important is it that annexed areas match the character of existing City neighborhoods?

Total Important91%
Total Not Important4%
Neutral5%

Very Important80%
Somewhat Important.....11%

Not Important at All2%
Not Very Important2%

T12. What design features would make annexed development more acceptable to you?
Please select all that apply.

Preservation of natural features	73%
Parks and public gathering spaces	61%
Trail connections	56%
High-quality architecture	47%
Larger setbacks/buffers from existing neighborhd.	44%
Limits on building height	43%
Traffic improvements	41%
Walkable street design	35%
Smaller-scale commercial areas around the city	22%
Mix of housing types	10%
Larger-scale, concentrated commercial areas	8%
Other*	14%

*Most of the “Other” responses simply reiterated an opposition to any annexation.

Open Space, Parks, and Natural Areas

T13. How important should open space preservation be when evaluating annexation proposals?

Very and Somewhat Important	97%
Very Important	88%
Somewhat Important.....	9%
Not Important at All	1%
Not Very Important	1%
Neutral	1%

T14. Should the City require a minimum amount of open space in annexed developments?

Yes	86%
It depends on the project	12%
No	1%
Unsure	1%

T15. If open space is required, what amount would you generally support?

Less than 10% of the site	2%
10% to 20% of the site	11%
21% to 30% of the site	11%
More than 30% of the site	37%
It should depend on location and natural features..	34%
Unsure	5%

T16. What types of open space should be prioritized in annexed areas? *Please select up to three.*

Wildlife habitat	75%
Trails and trail connections.....	72%
Neighborhood parks	34%
Drainageways or floodplain preservation	23%
Scenic viewsheds	22%
Buffers between developments.....	19%
Active large community parks	12%
Public plazas or gathering spaces	8%
Other*	5%

*Most of the “Other” responses simply reiterated an opposition to any annexation.

T17. What should be clearly defined before annexation is approved? *Please select all that apply.*

Required open space.....	78%
Types of allowed land uses	78%
Fiscal impact to the City.....	67%
Maximum residential density.....	66%
Regulatory restrictions (habitat, wetlands, etc.)	66%
Utility and service plans (water, gas, services, etc.)	66%
Location of allowed land uses	64%
Parks, trails, and recreation amenities	64%
Roadway improvements.....	59%
Public safety service impacts	50%
Maximum commercial square footage.....	49%
Design standards.....	49%
Location of a neighborhood public school	38%
Development/Construction phasing	33%
Other*	11%

*Most of the “Other” responses expressed “all of the above” or simply reiterated an opposition to any annexation.

Infrastructure, Services, and Fiscal Impact

T18. What public service impacts concern you most with annexation? *Please select up to three.*

Traffic congestion	65%
Water and sewer service	51%
Long-term City maintenance costs	39%
Fire and emergency services	34%
Road maintenance.....	27%
Police services	18%
Schools.....	14%
Parks and recreation demand.....	10%
Stormwater management	3%
Snow removal	2%
Other*	8%

*Most of the “Other” responses expressed “all of the above” or simply reiterated an opposition to any annexation.

T19. What community benefits should the City seek from annexation proposals? *Please select up to three.*

Preserved open space.....	76%
Trail connections	43%
Roadway improvements.....	40%
Local-serving retail or restaurants.....	32%
New parks	30%
Civic or community facilities.....	8%
Affordable or attainable housing	6%
Senior housing	6%
Employment opportunities.....	5%
Regional commercial opportunities	5%
Other*	10%

*Most of the “Other” responses simply reiterated an opposition to any annexation.

Annexation Evaluation Criteria

T20. On a scale of 1-10, with 1 meaning not important at all and 10 meaning very important, rate the importance of the following factors when evaluating annexation proposals.

	<u>10</u>	<u>8-10</u>	<u>5-7</u>	<u>2-4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>No Answer</u>
Open space preservation	58%	77%	14%	2%	1%	6%
Traffic and transportation impacts	52%	78%	14%	2%	1%	5%
Overall community benefit	50%	72%	14%	3%	2%	9%
Environmental impacts	50%	69%	17%	4%	2%	8%
Fiscal impact to the City	45%	71%	18%	3%	2%	6%
Parks and trails	42%	67%	24%	2%	1%	6%
Compatibility with existing neighborhoods in Castle Pines	39%	64%	23%	3%	2%	8%
Public service impacts	28%	49%	28%	5%	4%	14%
Housing options	8%	18%	30%	22%	18%	12%
Commercial or employment opportunities	4%	13%	24%	28%	25%	10%

T21. Which factors should be “must-haves” before annexation is considered? *Please select all that apply.*

Preservation of significant open space76%
 Adequate roads and infrastructure69%
 Positive fiscal impact62%
 Clear public benefit.....62%
 No negative impact on City services61%
 Detailed master plan53%
 Direct connection to City boundaries52%
 Compatibility with nearby neighborhoods50%
 Strong design standards47%

 Other*12%

*Most of the “Other” responses simply reiterated an opposition to any annexation.

T22. Should the applicant be required to conduct public outreach before submitting an annexation petition?

Yes86%
No9%
Unsure5%

T23. What types of outreach would you like to see an applicant conduct?

Transparency and Detailed Information: Residents repeatedly asked for complete, understandable, and honest information about any proposed annexation before decisions are made. They want detailed development plans and renderings, clear explanations of benefits and drawbacks, full disclosure of costs and funding sources, independent impact studies, and all information presented in plain language.

Robust Public Engagement Through Meetings and Outreach: Respondents overwhelmingly supported multiple opportunities for residents to learn about and discuss proposals. Preferred methods included town halls, public hearings, open houses, community forums, Q&A sessions, virtual and in-person meetings, and mailers, emails, newsletters and websites.

Direct Resident Approval and Voting: A significant share of respondents believe annexation decisions should not rest solely with City Council. They advocated for community-wide votes, majority approval requirements, surveys tied to decision-making, petition thresholds, and generally residents having the “final say”.

Focus on Community Impacts and Protecting Quality of Life: Residents consistently emphasized that any outreach should clearly address the potential impacts on Castle Pines' character and resources. Top concerns included water availability, traffic congestion, infrastructure capacity, environmental and wildlife impacts, schools impacts, and impacts to community character and open space.

*Verbatim responses will be included in a separate document.

T24. Which policy direction do you most support?

Discourage most annexation36%

Allow annexation but evaluate proposals cautiously
on a case-by-case basis32%

Limit annexation to only special circumstances16%

Encourage annexation that advances City goals
and provides clear public benefits.....14%

Unsure2%

T25. How should the City balance growth and preservation?

Prioritize open space and community character.....38%

Balance growth w/strong standards, pub. benefits 32%

Limit growth as much as possible.....25%

Prioritize growth and economic opportunity4%

Unsure1%

T26. What would make you more supportive of a future annexation proposal?

Preserve Castle Pines' Character and Small-Town Feel: Residents consistently emphasized that any future annexation must protect what makes Castle Pines unique. This included maintaining the “bedroom community” identity, preserving small-town atmosphere, avoiding becoming like Parker, Highlands Ranch, or Castle Rock, and matching existing design standards, lot sizes, and aesthetics. The strongest condition for support is that growth must reinforce—not fundamentally change—the community identity residents value.

Protect Open Space, Wildlife, and Natural Beauty: Environmental preservation emerged repeatedly as a prerequisite for considering annexation. Residents emphasized open space preservation, wildlife habitat protection, trail connections, maintaining rolling landscapes and views, and buffer zones between development and nature. Many respondents see Castle Pines' natural environment as one of its defining assets and expect future development to preserve it extensively.

Ensure Infrastructure Capacity, Especially Water: Residents repeatedly questioned whether the city can support additional growth. Major concerns included water supply, traffic congestion, schools, emergency services, and roads and utilities. Many respondents indicated that annexation could only be acceptable if existing infrastructure is not strained and developers provide solutions rather than shifting burdens onto residents.

Demand Clear Community Benefits and Fiscal Value: Residents were more receptive to annexation when it delivered tangible benefits to current residents. The most desired benefits included high-quality restaurants, small businesses and local retail, increased sales tax revenue, parks and recreation amenities, and positive fiscal impacts without raising taxes. Residents are much more supportive of annexation that improves amenities and finances the city, particularly through commercial development, rather than simply adding housing.

*Verbatim responses will be included in a separate document.

T27. What would make you less supportive of a future annexation proposal?

Opposition to High-Density Housing and Additional Residential Growth: The strongest concern was resistance to more housing—particularly apartments, multifamily developments, affordable housing, and "cookie-cutter" neighborhoods. Residents repeatedly mentioned high-density housing, apartments and condos, small lot developments, and multifamily projects, as well as just generally any continued residential expansion, as reasons for opposing annexation. Many residents believe Castle Pines has already experienced sufficient residential growth and strongly oppose proposals that would further increase population density.

Protect Community Character and Avoid Becoming Other Suburbs: Respondents consistently expressed concern about preserving Castle Pines' identity and preventing it from becoming another large suburban community. Common sentiments included maintaining the small-town feel, protecting property values, and preserving an upscale community image unlike other suburban communities. Residents view Castle Pines' distinct identity as one of its greatest assets and fear that unchecked growth would permanently alter it.

Concerns About Infrastructure, Water, and Traffic: Residents repeatedly cited practical limitations on growth, and mentioned concerns with traffic congestion, water availability, school overcrowding, public services and emergency response, and roads and utilities. Many respondents believe the city is already strained and that additional annexation would worsen existing infrastructure challenges.

Distrust of the Process, Developers, and Lack of Resident Input: A number of residents expressed frustration with how annexation decisions have been handled. Key concerns included developer influence, lack of transparency, decisions without public votes, and rushed approvals. Beyond opposition to specific projects, many residents voiced a broader lack of trust in the annexation process itself and want stronger accountability and public involvement.

*Verbatim responses will be included in a separate document.

T28. Is there anything else you would like the City to consider as it develops an annexation policy?

Preserve Castle Pines' Character and Small-Town Identity: Residents repeatedly emphasized that people chose Castle Pines precisely because it is different from surrounding communities. The strongest theme is a desire to preserve the community identity and lifestyle that attracted residents in the first place.

Protect Open Space, Wildlife, and Natural Beauty: Residents consistently identified environmental preservation as central to Castle Pines' future. Open space and wildlife are viewed not simply as amenities, but as defining characteristics of the community that future generations should inherit.

Slow Growth Until Infrastructure Catches Up: Residents repeatedly argued that the city should address existing challenges before considering additional annexation. Many residents believe Castle Pines has not yet absorbed previously approved growth and should focus on strengthening current infrastructure before expanding further.

Demand Transparency, Resident Input, and Community Control: There was some concern about decision-making processes and a desire for residents to have a stronger voice. Residents emphasized that decisions should be transparent, deliberative, and clearly driven by community interests rather than developer priorities.

*Verbatim responses will be included in a separate document.

Demographic Questions

And now, we have a few questions for statistical purposes only.

T29. How long have you lived in the City of Castle Pines?

Less than a year.....	1%
1 to 5 years.....	35%
6 to 10 years.....	20%
11 to 20 years	18%
More than 20 years	26%

T30. Which best describes you? Please select all that apply.

City resident91%
City property owner31%
City business owner5%
Work in the City4%
Live near the City but outside city limits0.3%

T31. What area of the City do you live in?

West of I-2578%
East of I-2522%

Survey Data Collection Methodology

The data collection methods utilized MMS text messaging and the distribution of a survey link through the City’s Annexation Policy webpage. The interviews were conducted from May 18th – June 14th, 2026. This survey has a margin of error of +/- 3.86% at the 95 percent confidence interval. Any questions regarding the survey findings or methodology should be directed to Ryan Winger of Magellan Strategies. He can be reached by email at RWinger@MagellanStrategies.com.
