



Ph: 970-871-6772 · Fax: 970-879-8023 · P.O. Box 775966 · Steamboat Springs, Colorado 80477

December 6, 2021

City of Steamboat Springs Planning Department Plan Review Service – Attn: Bob Keenan
137 10th Street
Steamboat Springs, CO 80477
Phone: (970)-871-8207, Fax: (970)-879-8851

RE: **Copper Ridge Business Park F4 L3 (1716 Copper Ridge Spur, 2660 Copper Ridge Cir) 236600003**

Dear Toby,

We have reviewed the DRT letter dated June 2, 2021 for the above project. We are resubmitting the plans based on the review and offer the following responses:

Planning – Bob Keenan

Revisions Required:

1. Please provide the required mineral rights affidavit. **Provided with this submittal**
2. Your proposal includes offsite improvements. Which require approval from those property owners with this application. No further review of this application will be made until property owner consent is achieved.
 - a. Fill in the Greenbelt A, needs an agreement/temporary easement required. Will it impair drainage. Revegetation required if approved. **Fill in Greenbelt A is no longer proposed.**
 - b. A temporary turnaround on lot 2 **Bob Zibell has agreed to this turnaround and will grant prior to final approval as they work out the Airpark plat.**
 - c. Sewer main in Greenbelt and West Acres Subdivision Lot 10. **A new path along Gloria Gossard is proposed as West Acres Subdivision is not cooperating with the request.**
3. Your narrative and criteria for approval both incorrectly state that lot 1 is to be zone MF-1, it will be zoned MF-3 when platted. **Narrative corrected.**
4. Similarly, your variance narratives need to be update with the correct zoning. **Variance corrected.**
5. Revise the cover sheet to correctly indicate the MF-3 zoning and standards. **Cover sheet corrected.**
6. The narrative indicates 5 year build-out, however, the Development Plan vesting is for 3 years. Let's discuss your approach to this. **Understood, we would like to discuss during this submittal review.**
7. The plan set includes a Preliminary Plat page. What is the purpose of this? There is no Preliminary Plat application submitted as such, we will not be reviewing this page. Our policies require concurrent review of applications. Let's discuss. **Page was added for additional information and will be removed from the set.**
8. Per Access Section 436, and the approved Preliminary Plat plat note, the proposed roadway shall be a public street and ROW dedicated. This will require a Preliminary Plat application as it will result in the creation of two lots. **A preliminary plat will be submitted as this project progresses.**
9. Phase II secondary access, easements/ROW are needed at this time. **A new preliminary plat is currently being worked out between the owner of the Steamboat Airpark property and this property. This plat will be submitted soon and include the secondary access. The proposed layout of this ROW is included on sheets C9-C10.**
10. All plans shall include building # labels. **Building labels included in all plans.**

11. Provide confirmation that no wetlands exist in the site. **Wetlands letter included with this resubmittal. No wetlands present.**
 12. Site Plan
 - a. Depict the Building and Growth Restriction line as depicted on the Preliminary Plat that bisects this property. **The line was depicted as avigation easement. The callout has been updated to match the plat callout.**
 - b. Depict and label the open space as proposed in the PP and Final Plat. **Labels added to site plan.**
 - c. What is the double bold line that follows the eastern edge of what looks like ROW? **A mistake that has been removed.**
 - d. Label what looks like ROW. **It is labeled and dimensioned already.**
 - e. It appears that the north east corner of the parking lot for building 3 does not meet the minimum parking lot setback for them MF-3 zone per section 214. **10 ft setback achieved per zoning, dimension has been be added for clarity.**
 - f. Depict building setbacks to the proposed ROW. **Setback added to site plan.**
 - g. Sidewalks for the street shall be constructed all the way to the property line. **Sidewalks extended as needed.**
 - h. It appears that the building 3 entrance does not connect to the sidewalk. **Sidewalk connections added.**
 - i. The site plan does not appear to indicate what building types are proposed for the numbered buildings. **Building types added to all plans.**
 - j. Phasing east/west description is inaccurate. **Phasing plan updated to include outline of proposed phases. Hatching for phase one included and updated.**
 - k. Provide sidewalk connecting the main drive to the east buildings on north side of drive. **Sidewalks added around the proposed play area to the west of Building #4.**
 13. Parking, 406 –
 - a. Please provide the unit size in sq. ft. in the parking analysis. Workforce units cannot exceed 1,000 sq. ft. per the use standards. **Unit sizes have been added to the parking analysis on the site plan.**
 - b. Please identify on the floor plans which units are to be workforce units. **Workforce units called out on floor plans.**
 - c. Provide bike parking spaces in the parking analysis. **Bike parking was provided but has been changed to dedicated bike parking and ski locker rooms for each building. The rooms will have at least 10 bike parking spaces each.**
 - d. Per CDC Section 406, the underground parking drive isles are required to be no less than 24', please revise. **Elevator locations adjusted to provide a consistent 24' wide drive isle.**
 - e. Number the parking spaces on the site plan and allocate them to their respective building. **A parking and vehicle turning exhibit plan on page C4 has been added to the plan set. The parking spaces have been outlined for each building to show each one has the required spaces. The parking spaces will not be assigned when constructed with all residents free to park where they want.**
 - f. On street parking cannot be counted towards required parking per CDC 406. How is the on-street parking to be used?. **Parking along the street has been removed.**
 - g. Provide turning templates on the underground parking to ensure that the parking spaces are accessible. **Turning template for the hardest to reach space for a typical building has been added to page C4.**
 14. Landscaping, 402 – (Responses provided by Hickory Flats Landscape)
 - a. The proposed street requires frontage landscaping please include to landscaping plans and provide the analysis. **INTERIOR STREET FRONTAGE INCLUDED IN THE REVISED DRAWINGS.**
 - b. Frontage category analysis on the landscape plan indicates Hwy 40, revise. **REVISED**
 - c. Landscape category analysis shall include linear feet of frontage multiplied by the required depth. **THIS HAS BEEN REVISED WITH ADDITIONAL TEXT.**
 - d. Landscaping plans shall include calculations and hatching denoting the required parking lot setback from the proposed street. **THIS IS NOT SOMETHING THAT HAS BEEN INCLUDED IN PREVIOUS LANDSCAPE PLANS AND WOULD ADD CLUTTER TO THE EXISTING DRAWINGS. THE SETBACK AND EASEMENTS ARE DENOTED ON THE DRAWINGS.**
-
-

- e. Please utilize the frontage, parking lot setback, interior, and interior parking lot hatching/highlighting on all landscape plans as to distinguish the various required landscaping. **THIS WILL ADD CLUTTER TO THE MASTER PLAN DRAWINGS. THIS IS NOT A REQUIREMENT FOR SUBMITTAL AND IS SOMETHING EXTRA THAT HAS BEEN REQUESTED ON SOME PROJECTS, AND NOT OTHERS. ADDITIONAL DRAWINGS CAN BE ADDED TO THE PACKAGE.**
 - f. It is unclear whether the parking lot landscaping requirements are met please review and amend the plan to demonstrate compliance. **SEE THE REVISED DRAWINGS AND CALCULATIONS. ADDITIONAL PLANT MATERIALS HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE IMMEDIATE AREAS SURROUNDING THE PARKING AREAS TO INCREASE SCREENING.**
 - g. Landscape Plan L2 legend indicates hwy 40 frontage, revise. **REVISED**
 - h. The landscape enlargement plans shall include the northwest portion of the site which is currently omitted. **ENLARGEMENTS HAVE BEEN RE-ALIGNED AND A 4TH ADDED TO INCLUDED THE MISSING AREA**
15. Revegetation, 404 – **(Response provided by Hickory Flats Landscape)**
- a. All disturbed areas shall be revegetated. Provide a revegetation plan as required. The landscape plan includes a limits of disturbance line that fails to include disturbance from utilities such as sewer and water infrastructure. **SEE LANDSCAPE MASTER PLAN – UTILITY EASEMENTS HAVE BEEN HATCHED TO SHOW PROPOSED SURFACE TREATMENT.**
16. Proposed Variances – Staff has no comment on the proposed variances until further information is provided by the applicant that helps to inform the proposal. Understood.
- a. Average Plate Height –
 - i. Revise to use the code terminology instead of “base plate height”. **Base plate height terminology removed.**
 - b. Overall Building Height –
 - i. It is unclear if building 5 is the only one that exceeds building height and it is unclear if building 5 is 67’ tall. See building height comment below. **The variance request and architectural plans have been updated with this submittal to include more information and additional clarity.**
 - c. Interior Landscaping – **(Responses provided by Hickory Flats Landscape)**
 - i. Staff suggests increasing the interior landscape area to include most of the south area below the buildings and parking lot. **THE INTERIOR LANDSCAPE AREA HAS BEEN CALCULATED USING THE LIMITS OF DISTURBANCE AS SUGGESTED PREVIOUSLY. THE INTENTION IS TO REDUCE THE QUANTITY OF PLANTINGS REQUIRED TO ACCOMMODATE THE CHANGING CLIMATE OF THE YAMAPA VALLEY AND TO LIMIT THE AMOUNT OF DRINKING WATER USED IN THE LANDSCAPE FOR IRRIGATION. THE SITE IS CURRENTLY COVERED WITH NATIVE PLANT MATERIAL, AND DISTURBANCE TO THE EXISTING LANDSCAPE SHALL BE MINIMIZED.**

TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PLANTINGS AS COMPENSATION FOR THE USE OF THE LIMITS OF DISTURBANCE FOR CALCULATING PLANTINGS, THE DENSITY OF PLANT MATERIAL WAS INCREASED FROM THE REQUIRED CALCULATION OF ONE PLANTING PER 500 SF OF LANDSCAPE AREA AS NOTED IN CATEGORY ‘B’ (TABLE 402-2) AS REQUIRED FOR THE MF-3 ZONING. PLANT MATERIAL HAS BEEN CALCULATED USING CATEGORY ‘A’ OF THE SAME TABLE. THIS REQUIRES ONE PLANTING PER 400SF OF INTERIOR LANDSCAPE AREA.
 - ii. Interior landscaping can help buffer and mitigate the height of the buildings that are proposed. **ADDITIONAL PLANTINGS ABOVE WHAT HAVE BEEN CALCULATED HAVE BEEN ADDED TO THE PLAN TO INCREASE THE AVAILABILITY OF SHRUBS FOR INSTALLATION AROUND THE BUILDINGS. THE VEGETATION AS PROPOSED IS SUFFICIENT FOR MEETING THE SCREENING REQUIREMENTS AS OUTLINED IN THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE.**
-
-

- iii. What is the acceptable alternative proposed? FPSE – The variance request has been updated for a request for unnecessary hardship.
 - d. Revegetation – Let’s discuss further –
 - i. It is unclear which areas of the site are proposed to not be revegetated. Revegetation variance will no longer be requested.
 - ii. How will erosion be prevented? Revegetation variance will no longer be requested.
 - iii. Why not reduce the slope angle to allow for revegetation? Grade will not be caught if slope is reduced. Revegetation variance will no longer be requested
 - iv. What is the acceptable alternative that is proposed? Revegetation variance will no longer be requested.
 - e. Retaining Wall Height –
 - i. To be evaluated after receiving further information. See retaining wall comments below. Understood.
 - ii. Staff suggest that you look into another alternative. Staff believes that the intent will be achieved by limiting wall heights. In order to catch grade on site, walls will need to be higher than 11 feet. Please see new profiles of retaining wall on sheet C7.
 - f. Skyline –
 - i. Shouldn’t the analysis be for Standards for New Development as the Preliminary Plat has already been approved? The analysis code section has been updated.
 - ii. Refer to the proposed zoning of MF-3. Zoning updated.
 - iii. The proposal for not revegetating slopes would seem to conflict with the requirements for the improvements to blend with the landform. The revegetating variance is no longer requested.
 - iv. Staff suggest that photo simulations be provided, or other documentation be provided that there would be no protrusions into the skyline. We are not proposing that there would be no protrusions, just that the protrusion is not significant as the site can only be seen from two small locations. FPSE sees the impact as minimal based on the analysis and the photos provided are clear to that affect. The conclusion in the skyline narrative has been updated to clarify that position.
 - v. A waiver may not be necessary if there are no protrusions. There are protrusions expected with the proposed development however they will not be significant as they are only in two small areas along US Highway 40. The skyline overlay zone purpose in section 234.A of the CDC states. “The Skyline Overlay zone is intended to ensure development of properties containing visually significant skylines does not negatively impact the skyline as viewed from designated public vantage points.” FPSE believes that the skyline is not visually significant and portrayed that in the variance request. If the City is in agreement with the position that the projects skyline is not significant, then we would be happy to pull the request.
 - vi. Staff suggests that you add a vantage point on the south side of Lincoln Avenue at Lagoon Court. This was looked at but we found no visible path to the site. That finding will be included with the skyline narrative update included with this submittal.
 - vii. The first vantage point, Downhill/Lincoln Ave, should be taken from the south side of Lincoln, the most impactful vantage point. That is included in the skyline exhibit, the South side of Lincoln traffic travels east so the driver would be looking behind them the see the site. That is why the North side was determined to have more impact. A photo from this location has been added to the skyline narrative.
 - 17. Refuse Management, 408 –
 - a. The code requires recycling as well as trash containers, label on site plan. Recycling included with new trash enclosure.
 - b. Provide building elevations for refuse enclosures that meet the standards. Trash enclosure plans included with this resubmittal.
-
-

18. Snow Storage, 409 – Label or use a legend to identify the snow storage. It's difficult to see the extents of the snow storage as compared to other site features, please make clearer. **The extents of the snow storage has been darkened for clarity. The legend on the cover page is updated for that change.**
 - a. Are there areas that exceed the 20' from paved area? **No**
 - b. Are their downhill or uphill areas that qualify for increase or reductions to snow storage areas per table 409-1? **Not in any significant way.**
 19. Phasing, 413 –
 - a. The proposed street will likely be required as part of a subdivision improvements, if so, can be removed from phasing plan. The roadway will be required to be fully constructed including sidewalks on both sides. **The road has been removed from the phasing plan and a note added about when this road needs to be completed.**
 - b. Why is parking in phase II included in phase I? **That parking is required to comply with parking counts for Buildings 1-3. The main road does not delineate phasing so that parking is part of phase 1 as shown in the plan.**
 - c. Provide parking breakdown for each phase on the phasing plan. **This is included in the site plan on Page C3 and has been added to the phasing plan.**
 - d. Consider providing the closest playground as part of phase 1. **Playground near building #4 added to phase 1.**
 - e. If you are proposing any grading of part of the property identified as phase II with phase 1 construction, identify that now. **The grading for Phase II will be done as part of the whole projects permit but will not be asked for acceptance with Phase 1. Note added to phasing plan.**
 20. Multimode Facilities, 414 – Consider providing a soft surface trail connection from the eastern part of the development down to Gloria Gossard or Acre Lane **This was looked at and no reasonable path could be obtained. In addition, we want to avoid disturbance on that hillside wherever possible for slope stability.**
 21. Internal Sidewalks – 417
 - a. Provide connection from building 5 entrance and walkways to the postal facilities and parking lot **Sidewalk added from proposed bike room to postal facilities west of building #5.**
 22. Retaining Walls, 418 –
 - a. Provide a summary and cross section of all retaining walls that require a variance note them on the site plans. **Summary added to sheet C7.**
 - b. Identify retaining walls that exceed 6' within the lot line setbacks. **No retaining walls are proposed in building setbacks.**
 23. Access, 436.C.4 – Public street is required for through access and connecting to a public street at both ends. It appears that the submittal does not meet this requirement. **Design of street included with this submittal.**
 24. Postal Facilities, 427 – provide confirmation that form, and location of the postal facilities is acceptable to US Postal Service. **Four Points has reached out multiple times to the local post office and have also contacted the district representative to get approval from the post office for the cluster box locations. Bob Keenan joined Four Points for one such meeting with the state representative office. Nobody from the post office has provided contact or review and Four Points does not anticipate that they will. Based on other projects in development, Four Points believes the locations outlined in the plans are sufficient for mail service.**
 25. Multi-family Residential Design Standards - 437
 - a. It appears that the proposed layout doesn't comply with 437.C, Building Placement Standards **The team feels this standard is met. Every building has one side with building entry points or access oriented to the proposed public or private streets.**
 - b. The proposed building orientation does not appear to orient to predominant public and private streets per 437.D. **All buildings appear to achieve this standard. Building #2 has a pedestrian access along the south face which is visible from the proposed road.**
 - c. Surface parking, 437.G is located between buildings and the street which does not meet this standard. **The surface parking as proposed appears to meet this standard. In lots with one street frontage (west side of Main Street), the parking is not the primary presence. Buildings 1-3 and landscaping take up more of the frontage than any proposed parking. Parking is placed to the side of the primary structures along the**
-
-

winding Main Street and does not exceed the width of the building frontage. On lots with two street frontages (east side of Main Street), parking is not being placed between the public street and the proposed buildings.

- d. Distinct Building Designs, 437.H.b– Your narrative indicates that 2 distinct building designs are required, however, with 7 buildings 3 distinctions are required.
 - i. It is unclear which building types go where on the site. Please label. **Building labels on all plans sheets.**
 - ii. It appears that this standard is not being met. Please revise. **Building variation chart added to Building Elevation plans.**
 - e. Provide actual color sample. **Colors shown in building perspectives and elevations.**
26. Building Height –
- a. It is difficult to provide comments on building height until we understand which buildings go where on the site. **All building elevations have been added to the submittal for clarity**
 - b. Will all building types have the same final grade as depicted on the building elevations? If not, provide additional building elevations. **Proposed and existing grade lines have been added to all buildings for clarity**
 - c. It appears that that overall building height calculations are not being measured to the top of the roof. Revise **Overall height dimensions have been added to all buildings.**
27. Lighting, 405 –
- a. Is there any building mounted lighting? Provide fixture types and locations. **Fixtures shown in architectural plans. Lighting plan updated.**
 - b. Lighting for pedestrian areas shall be limited to 16’ maximum. **A note has been updated in the lighting plan.**
28. Building Elevations –
- a. Photo simulations or computer modeling of the development would be helpful to understand the building placement and context. **Site model aerials have been provided on sheet A0.3.**

Draft Conditions of Approval:

1. Avigation and Airport Disclosure Agreements are required. **Understood.**
2. Critical Improvements **Understood.**
3. Civils **Not enough information.**
4. 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/Approval. **Understood.**

The owner or rental agency for the property shall provide an annual report to the Planning Director outlining compliance with the 48 deed restricted workforce housing units. **Understood.**

Engineering Review – Stuart King

Not Reviewed

- Sheet C11 Preliminary Plat- dated 4/27/2021 **Page removed from plan set.**

Conditions of Approval from PP 18-03

2. An approved Final Drainage Report and Civil Construction plans for the extension of Gloria Gossard Parkway, including sidewalk, storm drainage infrastructure and retaining walls along Gloria Gossard Parkway prepared by a licensed Colorado Professional Engineer are required prior to approval of an improvements agreement, construction permit, or final plat whichever occurs first. **Understood.**
 3. Prior to any Final Plat, the developer shall construct the extension of Gloria Gossard Parkway and the sidewalk on the north side of Gloria Gossard Parkway or provide surety. **Understood.**
-
-

4. Gloria Gossard Parkway and the sidewalk on the north side of Gloria Gossard Parkway are required to be constructed and preliminarily accepted prior to building permits being issued on the individual lots. **Understood.**
5. At time of future development submittal for lot 1 or lot 2, a Traffic Impact Report, Drainage Report and Soils Report in accordance with City Engineering Standards are required. **Understood.**

Revision Required

1. Narrative:
 - a. Second Paragraph mentions using city open space as a fill site to develop a community park. If city parks department is interested in development of a community park at this location, the concept requires drainage analysis and environmental analysis to determine the presence of wetlands, vegetation and wildlife habitat of interest on the open space prior to staff evaluation and recommendation. **This will no longer be a proposal as a part of this project and was removed from the narrative.**
 - b. Third Paragraph: The narrative states the preliminary plat depicts dedicating a roadway to the city of Steamboat Springs- clarifications of this statement is needed. If a preliminary plat dividing Lot 1 into 2 lots is proposed with a public roadway providing access to Airpark Subdivision lot 2 a Preliminary Plat submittal thru DRT may be required. If this is the case, portions of this review and Conditions of Approval will be revised accordingly. **Understood. The plat for West Acres Ranch Subdivision, FMA-21-04, is currently under review which addresses this situation with a possible new preliminary plat being considered. Statement removed from narrative.**
 - c. Third Paragraph mentions phasing including continuation of a public road across Lot 2 connecting back to Gloria Gossard. The current development plan needs to include the preliminary design for this public road on Lot 2. **Understood, plan set includes preliminary design of road on pages C9-C10.**
 2. Sheet C5
 - a. Remove "Fill Area" grading from city property. **Fill area removed.**
 - b. Show flow dissipation at all pipe outfalls. **Pipe outfall riprap added to plan set.**
 - c. 24" pipe at 20.2% outfall needs to be pulled back from the adjacent downstream property. **Outfall pulled back from property line.**
 3. The proposed public road (Main Drive) profile does not provide a 50 ft tangent with a grade of 4% or less at the intersection with Gloria Gossard. Revise accordingly. As Gloria Gossard is a major roadway, an engineering variance will not be approved for this design standard. **Slope adjusted at Gloria Gossard intersection.**
 4. Annotate the horizontal angle of intersection of the proposed public road (Main Drive) with Gloria Gossard. **Intersection angle annotated on sheet C7.**
 5. The proposed public roadway (Main Drive) cross section does not provide adequate snow storage. Revise accordingly. For reference: Neighborhood Street II- Swale provides a swale width of 8 ft. Neighborhood Street II- Valley Pan (on-street parking) provides 10 ft from the centerline of valley pan to the edge of sidewalk. An engineering variance will not be approved for this design standard. **North Sidewalk adjusted to street standard.**
 6. Extend the roadway profile to include the cul-de-sac turnaround. **Roadway profile extended through the cul-de-sac.**
 7. Per Engineering Standards Sec. 4.3.1 show a turning template for the design vehicle turning right from Gloria Gossard onto the development road without encroaching into oncoming traffic. **Turning template added to sheet C4.**
 8. Street trees are required. Revise plan and cross sections accordingly. **Street trees have been provided.**
 9. The proposed public street is approximately 900 ft long. The maximum block length per CDC 602.D is 660 ft. Refer to Engineering Standards Sec. 4.4.7 Block Length and Sec. 4.4.8. Cul-de-sac. The length of time the "Temporary Construction Turnaround" is proposed to be in place needs to be defined in the Phasing Plan. A paved cul-de-sac may be required. The narrative indicates the public street will continue thru lot 2 back to Gloria Gossard- a preliminary design is required for this public street at this time. **Preliminary design included with this submittal.**
 10. The Phasing Plan needs to provide information on subsequent phases. **A note outlining the proposed phasing added to Phasing Plan.**
-
-

11. The Secondary Emergency Fire Access Plan identifies the field access driveway which was approved with AFDP-17-04 as part of the fire access. The referenced field access driveway approved plan does not meet the requirements for a fire access. A preliminary plan for this portion of the fire access is required. **Fire access to the fire standards shown on pages C9 to C10 of the resubmitted plan set.**
12. The phasing plan needs to identify the timeframe the “temporary secondary fire access” will be in service prior to being replaced by the proposed public road across Lot 2. **Note added to phasing plan in outline.**
13. The cross section for the east drive does not appear to provide adequate depth of parking to allow an unobstructed 24 foot width of fire access. **Mislabeled cross section that has been corrected.**
14. Provide a preliminary design for intersection improvements at Downhill Drive/ Elk River Road as recommended in the Traffic Study. **A preliminary design for Downhill Drive and Elk River Road based on the traffic study recommendations is included in the plan set on page C14.**
15. Provide preliminary design for pavement marking and signing for intersection of Gloria Gossard at Downhill Drive. **Included with approved CDs for Overlook Park and added to the plan set.**
16. Drainage Study and Water Quality Plan
 - a. The capacity of the existing pipes under Gloria Gossard need to be evaluated using the current drainage criterial design storms.
Hydraulic calculations were performed for the existing pipes. Results for a surcharged condition and overtopping condition were provided in Appendix H, culvert calculations.
 - b. Nyloplast inlets are not allowed on public Right of Way.
Of course not. Denver Type 16 and 16 inlets were identified w/in the ROW and specified in the report.
 - c. Provide a table summarizing Checklist item VII K including velocity at all pipe outfalls.
A summary table of all pipe velocities was included in Appendix K. This includes the entire private network, culverts, and offsite drainage bypass pipe.
17. Traffic Study **See comments from Cassie Slade at the end of this DRT response addressing traffic comments.**
 - a. Clarification is needed regarding the calculation of the development traffic contributing to Downhill at US 40 and Downhill at Elk River Road.
 - b. The development proposal includes a public street to serve as site access and to provide through access for future development of Airpark Subdivision Lot 2. Revise sections of the Traffic Report to reflect this and provide a section with discussion/recommendations regarding the intersection of this public street with Gloria Gossard.

Draft Conditions of Approval:

1. The developer shall pay proportionate share of potential future intersection improvements of Downhill at US 40, calculated at TBD% of \$xx or \$xx. Payment shall be submitted prior to issuance of building permit. **Understood.**
2. Civil construction plans prepared by a licensed Colorado civil engineer are required to be submitted to DRT for review and approval prior to approval of an improvements agreement, a building permit or grading permit and prior to the start of any construction. **Understood.**
3. As recommended in the draft Preliminary Geologic Hazard Evaluation -Copper Ridge Village-Lot 1 Steamboat Airpark Subdivision, by NWCC dated 4/16/2021, Site specific geotechnical investigation reports are required for each cut and fill, for building sites, parking areas, water quality pond and roadway alignment. This Geotechnical Report shall be submitted at time of Civil Construction Plans. **Understood.**
4. As recommended in the draft Preliminary Geologic Hazard Evaluation -Copper Ridge Village-Lot 1 Steamboat Airpark Subdivision, by NWCC dated 4/16/2021, A Geotechnical Engineer shall be onsite during construction to evaluate all site grading and fill operations. These inspections shall be documented in Construction Phase Geotechnical report which is updated as necessary but not less frequently than weekly. **Understood.**
5. Prior to approval of civil construction plans, overlot grading plans, or issuance of a construction permit (Grade and Fill, Building, Foundation Only), the owner shall dedicate to the city the following easements through an agreement executed by all parties. A recorded copy of each shall be provided to the city:
 - a. Drainage easement related to the storm water quality treatment facilities including embankment extents and maintenance access from the public street. **Understood.**
 - b. Fire access easement on Airpark Subdivision Lot 2. **Understood.**

6. The following items are considered critical improvements and must be constructed and accepted (Public Improvements) or approved (Private Improvements) prior issuance of a certificate of occupancy:
 - a. Public road and sidewalks thru Airpark Subdivision Lot 1 including paved cul-de-sac. **Understood.**
 - b. Secondary Fire access road thru Airpark Subdivision Lot 2 connecting to Gloria Gossard. **Understood.**
 - c. Paved driveways and parking areas. **Understood.**
 - d. Sidewalks along Gloria Gossard adjacent to Airpark Subdivision. **Understood.**
 - e. Intersection improvements at Downhill at Elk River Road **Understood.**
 - f. Intersection improvements at Downhill Drive at Gloria Gossard. **Understood.**
 - g. Drainage infrastructure and stormwater quality treatment facilities. **Understood.**
 - h. Pedestrian crossing of Gloria Gossard with beacons. **No pedestrian crossing for Gloria Gossard is proposed. If the City is asking for this, they will provide input as to where these crossings are desired.**
7. The Secondary Fire Access is required to be maintained in safe operating condition, open and passible at all times. **Understood.**
8. The Ownership & Maintenance Plan for the water quality treatment facility shall be recorded prior to certificate of occupancy. **Understood.**

Informational comment:

CDC section 404.E Revegetation Collateral for Large Lot Land Disturbance requires an improvements agreement prior to approval of Building Permit for sites with over 5 acres of disturbed area. **Understood.**

Utilities – Amber Gregory

Revisions Required

- Written approval for access on to West Acres property to connect to the existing sanitary sewer main must be provided in writing prior to approval. **The West Acres ownership is currently unwilling to provide the required easement for the proposed sewer to the south of Copper Ridge Village. A new sewer alignment connecting to Downhill Drive is included with this submittal. The Copper Ridge Village owners are requesting the City of Steamboat Springs to assist with a potential eminent domain process to get that small easement on the West Acres property awarded. During the DRT meeting for this project, the City did express some interest in providing this assistance. A meeting can be set up anytime with the Copper Ridge Village development team to discuss these possibilities.**
- A 20-foot wide easement centered over the proposed public sanitary sewer main must be dedicated to the City of Steamboat Springs prior to plat approval. **Understood. This will be addressed in the preliminary plat process.**
- Phase 1 has a water main run longer than 600 feet. A loop is required. **The water main has been updated to loop back down to Gloria Gossard. Water main run going north from tee at Main Street and Side Street is 250 feet long.**
- A fire hydrant should be installed at the northern-most end of the water main near the turn around as a blow off. **Fire hydrant added in place of 2” blow off.**
- Sanitary sewer services cannot directly tap in to a public sanitary sewer manhole. **Sewer service to building #2 updated.**
- The landscaping plan is missing some of the sanitary sewer main. Show the entire main to determine if landscaping is properly located away from the mains. **From Hickory Flats Landscaping - DRAWING HAS BEEN UPDATED TO THE LATEST BACKGROUND PROVIDED**
- If fire suppression systems are to be installed, the proper water service layout showing fire suppression and domestic lines must be shown. **Service layouts updated to all buildings for fire suppression.**

Informational Comments

The applicant may want to consider moving the 12” water main connection to the west to keep it in the roadway. It would keep the water main within the roadway, remove the water main easement and reduce the number of bends. **Understood.** **The stub to the site is already proposed as part of the Gloria Gossard sidewalk construction drawings.**

Fire Department – Mike Middleton

Fire codes states: 501.4 Timing of installation. Where fire apparatus access roads or a water supply for fire protection are required to be installed, such protection shall be installed and made serviceable prior to and during the time of construction except when approved alternative methods of protection are provided. **Understood.**

The third paragraph of the narrative stating that completion of the secondary access road will coincide with occupancy of phase 2 is unacceptable. SSFR will only approve construction building permits for phase 2 when the secondary access road is paved and complete. (This requirement is just like the Sunlight subdivision). **Understood, the narrative has been updated.**

All access roads and turnarounds within the development must meet all fire access road standards including the paved secondary. **Understood.**

Please consider the above responses and corresponding updated plans as sufficient to approve the project for the City of Steamboat Springs. Contact me at matthewm@fourpointsse.com or call 248-444-3268 if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you;

Matthew McLeod, P.E.
Four Points Surveying and Engineering

MEMORANDUM

To: City of Steamboat Springs Engineering
From: Cassie Slade, PE, PTOE
Date: October 27, 2021
Project: Copper Ridge Village Development
Subject: Response to Comments (1st Submittal)

Fox Tuttle Transportation Group received comments from the City of Steamboat Springs staff received in spring/summer 2021 in reference to the submittal of the Copper Ridge Village Traffic Impact Study (dated April 27, 2021). We appreciate your thorough review, feedback, and follow-up discussions. The responses for the traffic related comments are listed below:

Overall changes: It should be noted that the number of apartments changed from 201 units to 198 units. The volumes, analysis, figures, tables, and report were updated accordingly. These changes did not impact the recommendations.

Comment 1. Clarification is needed regarding the calculation of the development traffic contributing to Downhill at US 40 and Downhill at Elk River Road.

Response: Calculations were added to the report.

Comment 2. The development proposal includes a public street to serve as site access and to provide through access for future development of Airpark Subdivision Lot 2. Revise sections of the Traffic Report to reflect this and provide a section with discussion/recommendations regarding the intersection of this public street with Gloria Gossard.

Response: Discussion has been added to Section 2.0, Section 6.0, and Section 12.0. Refer to the new introduction to Section 6.0 for discussion on the loop road and two accesses. It is not anticipated that the trips associated with Copper Ridge Village will utilize the west access since the looped roadway will have a significant out-of-direction distance and time.

\CRS