



October 23, 2023

Steamboat Engineering And Design (SEAD)
2740 Acre Lane Suite E
Steamboat Springs, Co 80487

Re: Riverfront Park PUD at 1920 BRIDGE LN

Dear Steamboat Engineering And Design (SEAD),

This letter shall serve as the Development Review Team letter (DRT) for PL20230260 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each comment or formally request an extension within 30 days of the date of this letter or the application may be withdrawn.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. Planning department finds that there are several items that should be discussed surrounding the higher level organization of this PUD and the unique circumstances of the illegal nonconformities. Initially there are questions surrounding the criteria for approval and whether or not it might be supportable. Staff would like to discuss the following:

- 1). Is a PUD warranted, appropriate, or desirable? The primary argument given for criteria 1 relates to dimensional standards, however it is possible for these to be registered as legal nonconforming without creating a PUD. Uses can also be registered legally nonconforming, however any of the uses that are currently illegal would not be solved by this process, each resident would have to go through the conditional use process and meet the use standards for Multi-Family in CS. Staff would like to discuss how a rezone to an existing zone district (CS, CN, MF?) might work and be more aligned with community goals.
- 2). When addressing criteria 6 and the "significant community enhancement not achievable through application of a standard zone district", staff do not find any of the listed positives about the development to be the result of the special zoning itself, nor are the listed positives a community enhancement caused by the development. Staff would like consideration for guarantees around what that community enhancement might be whether it is guaranteed deed restricted housing or the connection of the core trail along the river.
- 3). It is still not clear how the proposed PUD is superior in terms of community enhancement than is achievable with current zone districts. "Bringing the development into compliance" cannot be grounds for approval.

Several additional questions also arose that would help direct the conversation towards a productive outcome.

-What are the current uses and their attributed square footages? (Floorplans would be helpful to know if/how units have been expanded or split especially when assessing the viability of using an existing zone district)

-Please provide some sort of parking map and count. Understanding how parking counts will function especially around the garages will help inform how we interpret the parking analysis. Also, because subzones only encircle the buildings it is impossible to attribute and account for the associated parking if the use is to change (see final comments below addressing subzones). It is unclear as well how or why the 25 residential unit count was produced.

-It is unclear as to why certain uses in your PUD are prohibited, especially Multi-family or workforce in Subzone 1, when your argument for the Community Plan Amendment hinges on the expansion of housing.

-Are there existing easements or commitments for the core trail extension along the riverfront?

-Are there currently (illegal) residential units in excess of 1400 sf?

It will be most important to discuss the viability of a PUD now that we have begun to dig deeper into this, but please also provide or be ready to provide answers to the above questions at a meeting with staff.

If we go forward with the PUD, here are a collection of thoughts and comments that will be



relevant in your revisions.

- Open space will not be a subzone as open space is calculated as a site-wide metric.
- All subzones should collectively account for the entire site as there cannot be any unzoned land.
- You may choose to have a global subzone overlay that established setbacks along the perimeter of the site, as it appears you're running into setback complications (ie. 0' setbacks).
- Zone districts should be larger than the buildings to account for redevelopment of the site in the future (following the PUD zoning). This is not like a condo plat.
- We would see no reason to allow your PUD to alter landscape, bike parking, snow storage or open space standards. There would have to be a case as to why these alterations are necessary. Currently there appears to be adequate open space, space for snow storage, space for bike racks, and opportunities to landscape meeting code.
- Parking is also not allowed across property lines, so we will need to discuss more what a parking easement might look like.
- Any design standards around building scale, variation, and fenestration can just be legally nonconformed

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.

- Mineral Rights Notification: 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.
- The Building Department has had a meeting with the desing professionalls and owners, and we have provided what type of permits and requirements will be required if this new PUD is approved, so the applicants are aware of all the dwellings that were created illegally in the past without getting proper permits per unit number, if this application is approved for a new PUD then each owner will need to submit a building permit application for all the work that was done without obtaining proper permits in the past per our Code Compliance Case that has been started.
- tap fees will need paid prior to building permit approval. All altered units need to receive a building permit.

Sincerely,

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

Jeremy Brown
Planner