



October 07, 2025

KRUSE BUILDERS, LLC
996 Captain Jack Drive
Steamboat Springs, CO 80487

Re: Eddyline Townhomes at 1930 BRIDGE LN

Dear KRUSE BUILDERS, LLC,

This letter shall serve as the Development Review Team letter (DRT) for PL20250300 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each comment or formally request an extension within 30 days of the date of this letter or the application may be withdrawn.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. Is boiler building legally nonconforming?
2. Your narrative states that the parking lot side of the "tiny homes" does not have residential in the pedestrian active building frontage. While garages are exempt from the gsf calculation, they are still considered a residential component of the building and are therefor. That being said, staff do not feel as though the parking lot side of the building is a "pedestrian circulation area" and therefor exempt. Staff are generally willing to support this design, however the crux of the narrative should focus on supporting residential on the core trail side using a different argument.
3. The narrative addresses fencing that could not be found in any planset.
4. Please provide a percentage of the ground floor footprint that has a ground floor height in excess of 14' and the percentage that does not.
5. On page A5 is appears as though all garage doors on the riverfront building have been included in the glazing calculation (dashed orange) however only 50% of the doors are identified as glazing. Please confirm or clarify.
6. Staff do not support the glazing variance request as proposed. Staff believe there may be support for a reduction along the Western facade given the privacy concerns. Staff do not find support for glazing reduction along the Eastern facade at this time. To provide some relief to this calculation, the "buildings beyond" which you note as "ends of deck and other units" or the neighboring living room do not need to be used in to overall facade calculation.
7. Informational Comment: While staff appreciate the parking calculations for theoretical commercial, and appreciate the additional parking, this note is to acknowledge this approval is not necessarily approving any commercial uses at this time.
8. Show/Confirm compliance with 26' min. Frontage Height on "tiny homes". Currently the only measurement provided is for the top floor of attic storage at 24.1'
9. Drawing C8 Note 2 says "cutsheets for proposed lighting fixtures included as attachments with this submittal". No attachments could be found.
10. CDC 402.D.1.b Automatic Irrigation required.
11. Plant Schedule required.
12. Underlay proposed utilities plan on Landscape plan. It appears as though two ornamentals may be on top of a Sewer Main.
13. It appears as though the deciduous tree layer is not turned on.
14. Sheet 11.C footnote states "we plan to clear some of the shrubs near the river but will not surpass 54 shrubs or 18 plantings". The development shown in the site plan would not require a floodplain development permit, however the clearing of shrubs will. Please confirm if this is your intention so the appropriate guidance may be given and conditions added. Also, as it is written, is unclear if you are "removing no more than 54 shrubs" (with an undetermined remainder), or plan to "remove shrubs, leaving at minimum 54 shrubs". Please clarify.

15. Please identify the 21,260 sf number you are using for planting. At 2.1 acres for the proposed site, and around 30,000sf of proposed site development, the interior landscape number should be around 60,000 sf.
16. Bike racks required CDC 406.C.7
17. Provide details or architectural for the trash enclosure.
18. The Phasing plan doesn't make it clear when all landscape will be provided. Also, please note, CDC 413.C.1.d "The phasing plan shall include the following improvements with the first phase:...landscaping adjacent to required sidewalk and trail connections"
19. Development Plan PL20240033 requires 3,341 sf of snow storage on this subject property (there is no snow melt on 57 spaces according to the development plan). Please show or account for this.
20. Postal Facilities required CDC 424
21. CDC 437.D.1 Buildings shall prioritize orientation or primary pedestrian entries to... pedestrian circulation. Connections should be shown from units to the trail.
22. Identify slope of all roof pitches. CDC 437.F.1
23. Informational Comment: multifamily must include recycling service
24. Staff do not find the CDC 437.H.2 Townhome variation standard has been met particularly on the tiny homes.
25. Staff do not find CDC 437.H.3.g has been met to provide visual interest particularly on the important facade facing the trail. Aside from the deck, the Building masses themselves are shear vertical, and the repetitious 2nd/3rd story windows should be varied.
26. CDC 437.I.1.b Changes in materials shall occur where wall planes meet at an inside corner..."
27. Metal not a permitted Siding Material walls-Ground Story CDC 437.I.1.a and table C-1 Appendix C
28. Light Cream not an approved Primary Color. This would be closer to "Light tan" which is only an approved accent color (appendix B)
29. Please identify Mechanical equipment locations and compliance with 437.K.1
30. CDC437.K.4.a "trash collection... should be incorporated into the form of the principal building"
31. Will any work be done to the boiler building (materials, finish, color?)
32. please confirm architectural grade asphalt shingles.
33. (Site Plan) Informational Note: This stall is a parking island per PL20240033
34. (Site Plan) Per PL20240033, this space is required interior parking lot plantings that will need to be replanted/accounted for

2.

Engineering Review (Reviewed By: Makenzie Carroll)

1. All engineered and surveyed plan sheets and documents shall be signed and sealed by an Engineer, Surveyor, and/or Architect, as appropriate, prior to Engineering's review. Some

documents associated with certain application types may include a qualifying descriptor that only states "For Approval, Not for Construction". For more information regarding applicable submittal items, refer to "Complete Application Information" located on the Planning Department's webpage (<https://www.steamboatsprings.net/1387/Complete-Application-Information>).

2. All drainage studies, H&H studies, traffic impact studies, and geotechnical reports shall be signed and sealed by the Engineer, and considered final with no qualifying descriptors, prior to Engineering's review.
3. All stamps shall include a date of signature through the seal upon submission. Please update on all applicable sheets.
4. (Cover): Remove from all plan sheets and documents. Qualifying descriptor may be present on applicable plan sheets, but must instead state exactly "For Approval, Not for Construction".
5. (Existing Conditions): Existing Conditions plan should match what is currently existing, i.e. Riverfront Condos.
6. (Site Plan): Show parking spaces removed where proposed entry is located.
7. (Site Plan): Provide turning movements to ensure all cars can properly back out of garages.
8. (Site Plan): Show proposed drainage & access easement for SFDP.
9. (Site Plan): Where does this walkway lead to? It also appears to cross over a trail/trail easement.
10. (Phasing Plan): Include walkway with Phase 1.
11. (Traffic Study): Stamp required without disclaimer. Regardless of application type, all submitted traffic studies shall be considered final.
12. (Geotech Reports): Remove "Draft". Stamp required without disclaimer. Regardless of application type, all submitted geotech reports shall be considered final.
13. (Drainage Study): Remove "Draft." All drainage studies shall be final at the time of initial submission.
14. (Drainage Study): Remove disclaimer. Regardless of application type, all submitted drainage studies shall be considered final. Date stamp.
15. (Drainage Study Pg. 3): Show on exhibit.
16. (Drainage Study Pg. 3): This is not what is shown.
17. (Drainage Study Pg. 3): This is not Agate Street.
18. (Drainage Study Pg. 3): Please show this/confirm that design point can handle drainage
19. (Drainage Study Pg. 5): DP6 or DP1?
20. (Drainage Study O&M Plan): Remove disclaimer. Date stamp.
21. (Drainage Study O&M Plan): Spillway does not appear to be in the correct location based on outflow direction.



Utilities-City Review (Reviewed By: Amber Gregory)

1. The utilities plan does not meet the general allowable conditions of the the City of Steamboat Springs Standards. For instance, A trash enclosure is proposed on top of the sewer manhole and the water main. This is not allowed.

Parks and Recreation Review (Reviewed By: Matthew Barnard)

1. Asphalt driveway and riprap spillway (southeast of Boiler Building) encroach on trail easement.

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

- The following items are considered critical improvements and must be constructed and approved or accepted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy/Completion or approval of a Condo/Townhome Final Plat, whichever occurs first: • Access drive, driveway, and parking areas • Drainage improvements • Permanent storm water quality treatment facilities • Revegetation
- Record Drawings/CAD Files including drainage, PWQTF(s), and sidewalks shall be submitted prior to Final Engineering Site Inspection.
- Prior to Certificate of Occupancy/Completion, an executed Ownership and Maintenance Agreement for the Permanent Stormwater Quality Treatment Facility shall be recorded.
- Civil construction plans prepared/signed/sealed by a licensed Colorado Professional Engineer are required to be submitted to the RCRBD with a Building Permit/Grading Permit application for review and approval prior to the start of any construction.
- Prior to Engineering Final Approval Inspection, a Completion Letter signed and sealed by a Colorado Professional Engineer (Project Engineer) shall be uploaded to the applicable building permit condition.
- The 18 "tiny homes" have been reviewed and approved for use as either workforce housing OR multiple-family housing and therefore do not carry any agreement or deed restriction requirement by this approval. Should the applicant voluntarily decide to identify any of these 18 units as workforce housing, they may do so without additional review and under the following condition: The applicant shall enter into an agreement, acceptable to the City, restricting the occupancy of the Workforce Units to qualified residents as defined by the Community Development Code. The agreement shall be recorded at the Routt County Clerk and Recorder prior to Certificate of Occupancy/Completion.
- Should the owner identify any of the 18 "tiny home" units into workforce housing, the owner or rental agency for the property shall provide an annual report to the Planning Director outlining compliance with the deed restricted workforce units. The report



shall, at a minimum, list all workforce units and how the occupants for each unit met the definition of Qualified Resident as defined in Community Development Code Section 802.

- This Resolution approves the number of units, size and bedroom. Floorplans subject to review and approval at building permit to confirm compliance with unit sizes and inability to create additional units through lockoffs.

Sincerely,

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

Jeremy Brown, PLA, LEED AP
Planner