

February 8, 2023

City of Steamboat Springs Planning Department

**The Amble – Preliminary Plan Application**

*Thank you for the comments on our Preliminary Plat Application. We have considered the questions and comments and have modified our submittal. We have noted our responses to the questions in italics below:*

**Planning Review (Reviewed By: Bob Keenan, AICP)**

**1. The plat title should remove reference to Dev Rights and Resubdivision. Plat subtitle shall include the previous plat for reference. A Resubdivision of.....**

***Response:** The Plat title has been revised to 'Fifth Supplement to the Condominium Map and Plat of the Steamboat Grand Resort Hotel Condominium'.*

**2. The entire boundaries of Lot 1, Steamboat Grand Resort Hotel Condo need to be part of the plat as it is being resubdivided. Vicinity map should be updated to reflect this as well.**

***Response:** The common elements have been added to the proposed platting limits. The vicinity map has been updated on the Cover Sheet and Draft Final Plat. The applicant continues to respectfully object to the requirement that all of the Lot 1 property be included in the area to be replatted for the reasons set forth in the several e-mails on this subject previously submitted to City staff. However, without waiving such objection, for the purpose of resolving this issue the applicant has included the entirety of Lot 1 within such plat and is willing to request that the STEAMBOAT GRAND RESORT HOTEL CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION, INC. as the association of unit owners under STEAMBOAT GRAND RESORT HOTEL CONDOMINIUM DECLARATION (Grand HOA) sign the final plat. Applicant submits herewith in a draft final plat for review by the DRT and requests the DRT to provide any comments regarding it as soon as possible so the Applicant can discuss the final plat with the Grand HOA and attempt to obtain their agreement to sign it.*

**3. The Dedication and Ownership section shall include the dedication of easements proposed by the plat. Update the City Council approval to include acceptance of easements.**

***Response:** Noted – Plat language has been revised*

**4. Please provide a draft development agreement for City review restricting Tram lot from being a legally developable lot as suggested in the narrative.**

***Response:** A DRAFT development agreement attached*

**5. Provide a site plan that overlays the proposed plat on the existing conditions map to**

**clearly depict the areas that need to be included in the building envelope and easements. Or add topo and slope hatching to Civil Site Plan.**

*Response:* Please see sheet C.004 that was added specifically for this comment. Please note that there is not a proposed building envelope per se, but areas restricted by easements or designated no-build areas. Additionally, some of the existing areas with slopes exceeding 30% are to be removed by the proposed grading.

**6. Not used (repeat)**

**7. Grading plan doesn't appear to match existing conditions plan where it notes proposed slope removal areas (areas in excess of 30% slope).**

*Response:* The proposed grading plan removes all existing slopes exceeding 30% from within the buildable area as defined by setbacks, no-build areas and easement boundaries. The maximum proposed slope within the buildable area is 25% (4:1). There will be slopes exceeding the 30% value outside of the buildable area on the site, but not within it.

**8. Consider providing landscaping along entry drive and to screen retaining walls.**

*Response:* Thank you for the comment. Landscaping is purposefully not shown on the preliminary plat. The eventual landscaping is intended to be coordinated with the overall landscape theme of the final development and is detailed on the concurrent Development Plan submittal.

**9. The plat creates a nearly zero lot line adjacent to the Grand, how will they be able to access the exterior of their building for maintenance?**

*Response:* We have included a 10-ft 'no-build' area adjacent to the above ground Grand structure as shown on the revised drawings and draft plat. A proposed maintenance agreement and access easement coincides with this area and affords access to the subject area.

**10. What is going on with the trail the leads to the stairs along the southeast side of the Grand? Does there need to be an easement? Who does it benefit?**

*Response:* The existing asphalt path is a connection to the staircase from the emergency access road and will be incorporated into the pedestrian network shown on the Development Plan.

**11. Subdivision Standards**

**602.C.3 - It appears that proposed lot 1 exceeds the lot depth to lot width ratio 5:1.**

*Response:* Please see included variance letter

**602.A.5 - It appears that the proposed lot 1 exceeds the 15 degrees side lot line to front lot line allowance**

**Response:** Please see included variance letter and note that this condition is based on the existing parcel geometry and not from something proposed by the Applicant.

**602.A.6 - Lots shall be rectangular in shape. The proposed lot does not appear to meet this standards. Particularly along the Grand property.**

**Response:** Please see included variance letter and note that this condition is based on the existing parcel geometry and not from something proposed by the Applicant.

**602.B - It appears that a variance is needed to include areas that exceed the 30 % slopes within the buildable area of the lot.**

**Response:** With the proposed grading improvements, there are no areas within the building envelope that will have 30% grades – existing or proposed.

**Building envelope needs to include setbacks or, conversely, label areas that are not buildable. The plat shall include building restrictions on the master lot for areas that do not meet useable lot area, or this could be covered by open space dedication.**

**Response:** Lot 1 is restricted by underlying zoning setbacks, no-build areas and easements to define the buildable areas that meet the CDC requirements. Please refer to the revised drawings.

**602.C Multimode Facilities - Sidewalks are required along the entire length of the subdivision. This includes the master lot from which the property is to be divided.**

**Response:**

- **West Sidewalk – Exemption request**
  - Ownership is requesting an exemption per section 414.C #2 (below) – there is a sidewalk on the other side of the street and more pedestrian friendly.
- **414.C Exemptions: #2** The cost of including accommodations for all modes would be disproportionate to the need, particularly if alternative facilities are available within a reasonable distance as determined by the Planning Director.
- **East Sidewalk – Alternative Compliance: fee in lieu**
  - Ownership is part of the team working on the redesign of the GTC. We are working closely with the design team and coordinating design efforts. We are seeking alternative compliance in the form of a fee in lieu for this portion of the required sidewalk adjacent to the west side of the property so the sidewalk can be constructed with the surrounding GTC project.
- **North Sidewalk – Alternative Compliance: fee in lieu**
  - Ownership is requesting alternative compliance for a fee in lieu for north sidewalk subdivision request for the following reasons:
  - The URA complete streets map is calling this portion of the sidewalk a “complete

*project” - as a reminder this sidewalk is currently a soft surface trail and the soft surface trail was heavily negotiated between the City and The Grand several years ago. There are current easements on The Grand for the soft surface trail – part of the trail sits in Right of Way and part on The Grand parcel*

- *The URA complete streets map is showing the opposite side of the street (Area 4.a) on the complete streets for 2023 projects*
- *Ownership believes a Fee in Lieu more appropriate so the City can use for other complete street projects and even for the 4.a on the North side of the street as identified on the URA projects*

**602.L - Dedicated open space. The narrative indicates that there will be 9.64 acres of open space. Please provide dedication in accordance with this requirement. This shall include the required open space as approved with the original Steamboat Grand development.**

*Response: Please see note #12 on the Cover Page of the plat. The western side of the Knoll is not developable under the Steamboat Grand Revised Major Development and PUD which was the mechanism utilized by the City to protect this area from development in 1998 when the PUD was approved.*

**12. Coordinate with the URA and City Engineering Department to determine the extent of easements or additional Right of Way that may be necessary along the east side of the subdivision to facilitate the construction of the Gondola Transit Center per the Mountain Area Master Plan and CDC Section 602.F.2.e.**

*Response: Noted and current coordination efforts with URAAC are underway*

**13. Phase the fire access construction so that the new access is constructed before the current access is demolished.**

*Response: We understand the intent of this comment and the Contractor will need to coordinate with the Fire Department as part of the Construction Site Management Plan. There are areas where the proposed and existing access cross or conflict at different grades which prevents this comment from being achievable from a literal sense.*

**Building Department Review (Reviewed By: Todd Carr)**

1. Email sent to Erik with Landmark on 11/10/22 asks for a code review of the new proposed property line with respect to total distance to all exterior walls of the far South end of the Grand Hotel affected by this new proposed Plat, for compliance with Building and Mechanical Codes listed below.

Erik,

Thanks again for your time on this today, and the full history it helps me understand the two Planning Applications. Next, your picture actually now opens up another discussion we should have with the owners or any Architect they may be working with. The side of the mechanical room that will be very close to this new property line has openings, the huge louvers shown in

the photo, may be a code issue as well, plus we have to have someone review the Building Code for required setbacks to the new proposed property based on table 602 I provided below.

I'm glad to make a field visit as well to help understand what these louvers are used for with respect to intake or exhaust air. I have attached a lot of code sections that will be applicable to my review that I will need some additional information on before I can approve.

Grand Hotel: Originally Permitted under the 1999 UBC as Type IFR Construction, in today's 2018 IBC world this would be Type 1A Construction. So the table I added below table 602 will need to be reviewed by an Architect along with the mechanical code sections with respect to the new proposed property lines and distance to this existing building. As part of this review by the Architect and Building Department, we could identify if we have any issues with non-rated exterior walls that may exist, and then distances to openings, and distances to mechanical openings as well.

I will let you share this official review response with your client, and then you can let me know how they would like to proceed with this review process, good news is were out in front the review deadline, so hopefully we can resolve this before the end of this month.

Thanks Erik,  
Todd Carr

2018 IBC Table 602 must be reviewed for compliance to identify current rating on exterior walls with respect to new proposed setback to the property line from all exterior walls including the underground parking structure.

#### 401.4 Intake opening location.

Air intake openings shall comply with all of the following:

1. Intake openings shall be located not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) from lot lines or buildings on the same lot.
2. Mechanical and gravity outdoor air intake openings shall be located not less than 10 feet (3048 mm) horizontally from any hazardous or noxious contaminant source, such as vents, streets, alleys, parking lots and loading docks, except as specified in Item 3 or Section 501.3.1. Outdoor air intake openings shall be permitted to be located less than 10 feet (3048 mm) horizontally from streets, alleys, parking lots and loading docks provided that the openings are located not less than 25 feet (7620 mm) vertically above such locations. Where openings front on a street or public way, the distance shall be measured from the closest edge of the street or public way.
3. Intake openings shall be located not less than 3 feet (914 mm) below contaminant sources where such sources are located within 10 feet (3048 mm) of the opening.
4. Intake openings on structures in flood hazard areas shall be at or above the elevation required by Section 1612 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment.

#### 501.3.1 Location of exhaust outlets.

The termination point of exhaust outlets and ducts discharging to the outdoors shall be located with the following minimum distances:

1. For ducts conveying explosive or flammable vapors, fumes or dusts: 30 feet (9144 mm) from property lines; 10 feet (3048 mm) from operable openings into buildings; 6 feet (1829 mm) from exterior walls and roofs; 30 feet (9144 mm) from combustible walls and operable openings into buildings that are in the direction of the exhaust discharge; 10 feet (3048 mm) above adjoining grade.
2. For other product-conveying outlets: 10 feet (3048 mm) from the property lines; 3 feet (914 mm) from exterior walls and roofs; 10 feet (3048 mm) from operable openings into buildings; 10 feet (3048 mm) above adjoining grade.
3. For all environmental air exhaust: 3 feet (914 mm) from property lines; 3 feet (914 mm) from operable openings into buildings for all occupancies other than Group U, and 10 feet (3048 mm) from mechanical air intakes. Such exhaust shall not be considered hazardous or noxious.
4. Exhaust outlets serving structures in flood hazard areas shall be installed at or above the elevation required by Section 1612 of the International Building Code for utilities and attendant equipment.
5. For specific systems, see the following sections:
  - 5.1. Clothes dryer exhaust, Section 504.4.
  - 5.2. Kitchen hoods and other kitchen exhaust equipment, Sections 506.3.13, 506.4 and 506.5.

5.3. Dust, stock and refuse conveying systems, Section 511.2. 5.4. Subslab soil exhaust systems, Section 512.4. 5.5. Smoke control systems, Section 513.10.3. 5.6. Refrigerant discharge, Section 1105.7. 5.7. Machinery room discharge, Section 1105.6.1.

705.10 Ducts and air transfer openings.

Penetrations by air ducts and air transfer openings in fire-resistance-rated exterior walls required to have protected openings shall comply with Section 717.

Exception: Foundation vents installed in accordance with this code are permitted.

**Response:** *The building code separation requirement is proposed to be accommodated by the proposed 'no build' area that is 10-ft from the property line. Please see the revisions to the drawings reflecting the above comments.*

**Engineering Review (Reviewed By: Emrick Soltis, P.E.)**

**1. C.100: Soft Surface Trail is required to be paved and maintained year-round.**

**Response:** *Please see response 602.C above*

**2. C:100: A 8ft sidewalk that runs along the full length of the western property line is required with this subdivision.**

**Response:** *Please see response 602.C above*

**3. C.100: Sidewalk is required to eliminate the "missing link" within the Base Area multi-modal network. Easement may also be required for sidewalks located outside of the public right of way.**

**Response:** *Please see response 602.C above*

**4. C.100: How will snow storage in this area be treated prior to discharging offsite?**

**Response:** *This minimal area between the back of curb and the proposed retaining wall is outside of the capture area of the proposed water quality pond. This falls within the less than 20% of the site not being treated based on the site constraints. Although this area is not part of the formal water quality system, it is expected to remain pervious and will still receive passive treatment.*

**5. C.100: Railings may be needed at the top of retaining wall for fall protection.**

**Response:** Thank you for this consideration. This area is not adjacent to pedestrian facilities and is proposed to be landscaped as shown on the concurrent development plan. This area will be further reviewed during construction and if deemed appropriate, decorative fencing (e.g. split rail open fencing) may be considered.

**6. C.100: This existing pavement should be removed to eliminate the appearance of through access.**

**Response:** The existing pavement is shown as being removed to the extent that legal property access affords. This area will be further reviewed during construction and if deemed appropriate, additional measures such as a section of decorative fencing or signage may be installed.

**7. C.100: Include a provide and cross sections for the Emergency Access Road.**

**Response:** See sheet C.430 Emergency Access Cross-Sections

**8. C.300: Where is this drainage being conveyed?**

**Response:** The plans have been revised to include a "Lead Off Ditch" for this minimal area of runoff. Drainage will be conveyed via sheet flow to the existing roadside ditch north of the existing outfall under Mt. Werner Circle. This retains the historic flows of the existing "knoll" and has been accounted for in the Drainage Report.

**9. C.300: It appears that rip rap swales will be necessary to include with future civil construction plans.**

**Response:** Thank you. These have been updated after additional coordination between this preliminary plat package and the concurrent development plan application.

**10. C.300: Grading exceeds NWCC recommendation. What is the proposed design for this 1:1 graded area?**

**Response:** We apologize for the confusion. The labels have been corrected and the slopes cleaned up in the drawings to reflect 2:1 and are intended to comply with NWCC's recommendations.

**11. C.300: A guard rail may be required due to the 1:1 graded slope proximity to The West access road.**

**Response:** Thank you. The referenced slope label was corrected and the actual proposed slope is 2:1. While a guardrail may not be warranted based on the low volume of the road, we have shown a possible guardrail within the Applicant's property limits subject to field review after the access road has been constructed.



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

***Response: Noted - Thank you***

1. Submit a signed affidavit no later than eight days prior to the required public hearing confirming the required notice has been completed in accordance with Section 703.C.4.
2. The following items are considered critical improvements and must be constructed and approved or provide collateral via Improvements Agreement prior to issuance of a Construction Permit or approval of a Final Plat, whichever occurs first: • Water and Sewer infrastructure • Public and Private Street infrastructure • Access drive, driveway, and parking areas • Drainage improvements • Permanent stormwater quality treatment facilities • Sidewalk improvements • Trail improvements • Revegetation  
[Emrick Soltis @ 12/13/2022 11:05 AM]
3. 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.  
[Emrick Soltis @ 11/30/2022 12:12 PM]
4. Prior to any construction permit issuance, the final signed and sealed drainage study shall be submitted.  
[Emrick Soltis @ 11/30/2022 12:13 PM]
5. The infrastructure shown on the Preliminary Plat shall be constructed and approved and/or accepted or surety provided prior to recording of a Final Plat.  
[Emrick Soltis @ 11/30/2022 12:13 PM]
6. Civil Construction Plans prepared/signed/sealed by a licensed Colorado Professional Engineer are required to be submitted to DRT for review and approval prior to approval of any Improvements Agreement, Building Permit, Grading Permit, or Final Plat and prior to the start of any construction.  
[Emrick Soltis @ 11/30/2022 12:13 PM]
7. Record Drawings/CAD Files including drainage, PWQTF(s), and sidewalks shall be submitted prior to Final Engineering Site Inspection.  
[Emrick Soltis @ 11/30/2022 12:14 PM]
8. Prior to approval of Civil Construction Plans, the owner shall provide approved final draft documents to the City for the following required easements: • Drainage and access easement from Public Street related to the storm water quality treatment facility. • Public access easements for public sidewalks which are not completely within the right-of-way.  
[Emrick Soltis @ 11/30/2022 12:16 PM]

With the future development of lot 1, the applicant shall provide postal facilities in accordance with CDC Section 602.K.