



March 07, 2025

Cameron Breton
PO Box 770176
Steamboat Springs, CO 80487

Re: Bridge Lane Condominiums at 1960 BRIDGE LN

Dear Cameron Breton,

This letter shall serve as the Development Review Team letter (DRT) for PL20250033 Submittal #1. This letter as well as marked up documents and conditions of approval are available on Portal.

Your proposal has generated comments that need resolution prior to scheduling for hearing(s) or a decision being made.

Please address each comment and provide all requested items in one submittal to the Planning Department. Per CDC Section 702.I, you are required to provide a complete response that adequately addresses each comment or formally request an extension within 30 days of the date of this letter or the application may be withdrawn.

Please submit materials digitally through the Portal by uploading a **New Version** of each applicable document. Complete submittals shall be distributed within two business days of receipt. The resubmittal should include:

- The most recent revision date on applicable sheets
- A response to each individual comment
- Flattened PDFs of all materials

Also, please be aware that the following may be required if comments are not addressed with future submittals:

- Required Meeting: If DRT provides comments requiring a response on Submittal #2, a meeting with applicable DRT agencies is required prior to Submittal #3.
- Resubmittal Fee: If DRT provides comments requiring a response on Submittal #3, an additional application fee is required with Submittal #4 and all submittals thereafter. Resubmittal Fees are half the cost of the original application fee.

Please feel free to contact me at (970) 871-8244 or by email at jbrown@steamboatsprings.net with any questions or concerns.

Planning Review (Reviewed By: Jeremy Brown)

1. Provide lighting cutsheets or specifications for proposed fixtures. Confirm shielding and direction (CDC 405.D.2)
2. Please depict both of the proposed 6-yard dumpsters. Only one is shown and it is not clear how two 6' wide dumpsters will fit in a 11'-12' space and be serviceable.
3. Provide recycling capacity/facilities for at least 50% of trash capacity.
4. Landscaping must be addressed in phasing plan.
5. Address evergreen tree reductions in snow storage plan. Also, bike parking cannot be used for snow storage.
6. There are many areas missing planting or native grass/sod stippling/hatch. (southern facade of B3, western facade of B2, etc)
7. Your Landscape code analysis on Sheet L2 identifies exempt areas. The CDC does not provide for exemptions from calculations.
8. Existing Conditions plan should show the recorded trail easement associated with PL20240033.
9. Need at least one van accessible space.
10. Interior parking lot landscaping was calculated based on the new and "manipulated" spaces however the interior parking associated with PL20240033 accounted for ALL parking along bridge lane. Please provide an analysis for relocated interior parking lot landscaping from PL20240033 and then separately for the additional (new) parking spaces.
11. two spaces have been removed. Where have they been added? It appears as though covered parking will be a paid/premium parking condition and the new uncovered spaces will be interior to the development and not perceived as public.
12. Need detail for dumpster enclosure.
13. Open space from PL20240033 should be identified and rededicated through this planset.
14. Identify postal facility location and provide letter of approval from postmaster.
15. CDC 437.C.1.a (and 437.D.1) Access should be oriented towards pedestrian circulation (in this case building access and orientation should also address the Core Trail)
16. Identify roof pitch, particularly on BD3.
17. CDC 437.F.2 & 3 Identify snow hazard mitigation from roof snow slides particularly on BD3.
18. Provide detail for covered parking.
19. Northernmost covered parking area cross property line.
20. CDC 437.H.2 requires greater variability in BD2.
21. Provide glazing calculations for all facades.
22. CDC 437.H.3 Design buildings in the round with similar levels of detail. BD4 is perhaps the most asymmetric example of this providing a very different experience between the north and south facade.
23. Identify locations of mechanical equipment.
24. Review BD 4 against Duplex design standards (CDC 436) Particularly the requirements to avoid "mirror" design. This design consideration and approach could also be considered for BD3 which is in fact a 4-plex but reads like a duplex.

25. Ground floor building height min. 14'

Engineering Review (Reviewed By: Adan Camano)

1. Include existing IPA Width
2. (C2): Sign and seal by PE or PLS
3. Plans are difficult to review. Be consistent with line weights and line types for proposed and existing.
4. Floodway delineation appears to be incorrect.
5. (C3): Dedication of a shared access easement is required
6. (C3:) Will this area suffice for fire turnaround? Provide a turning movement plan.
7. Water Quality Swale cannot be located within the trail easement.
Private improvement located within public easement.
8. Existing Ditch on Northeast of property: What's going on here? Need to clean up the linework.
9. Are building FFE's above the BFE?
Confirm FFE is above BFE by 1'
10. Min. Horizontal curve along centerline = 61'
Engineering Variance Required.
11. Entire overflow swale needs to be riprapped.
12. 20' Drainage Easement required to be dedicated for PLDP and Storm Drain infrastructure.
13. Turning movements required to confirm if exit maneuvers can be done from these parking spaces.
14. Why does the PLDP and outlet structure differ between the sheets?
15. C7: Snow storage cannot be located within Trail Easement
16. DR: Provide information in Drainage Report about DB2.
17. DR: DR2
Need to confirm that existing PLDP from DP 5 will be able to accommodate WA for snow storage area
18. DR: Structure Report
Define Structures in the Structure Report of the Drainage Study.
 1. Catch Curb Inlet?
 2. Storm Manhole?
 3. Modified Type C Inlet?
19. DR: Structure Report
Are these Rim Elev. correct? Plans do not match
20. DR: Structure Report
Are these INVs. correct? Plans do not match
21. DR: O&M Plan Missing sections:
 - Inlet
 - Manhole
 - Underdrain



- Riprap sizing and dimensions
- Forebay

Final Project Manager Review (Reviewed By: Jeremy Brown)

Please see draft conditions of approval for this application below. All conditions of approval are also visible in Portal.

- At this time we can only offer informational comments to the applicant, as the architectural plans provide no code study information for the Building Department to review, and the site plan offers no proposed dimensions from property line to new buildings, nor information on distances from building to building on the site plan. We are currently reviewing plans under the 2021 ICC Codes, this project appears to possibly be being proposed as IRC townhomes, but it could be designed as IBC R-2 dwellings as well, were not sure of your intent. Either way this project would need to be reviewed for ADA compliance not just for parking, but access to the units and also inside the units, and requirements will be different dependent upon the code study and pathway through which code book. We have no other comments at this time until we are provided more information in terms of code study work. [Todd Carr @ 02/12/2025 10:51 AM]
- Prior to Building Permit issuance, the property owner shall record an avigation easement.
- Prior to Building Permit issuance, the property owner shall record an airport proximity disclosure.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jeremy Brown", is written over a light gray rectangular background.

Jeremy Brown
Planner