



February 02, 2024

Gates Gooding
124 10th Street
Steamboat Springs, CO 80487

Re: Gondola Transit Center Project Concept Review Application at 211077001

Dear Gates Gooding,

This letter shall serve as the Development Review Team letter (DRT) for PL20230354. This letter as well as marked up documents and conditions of approval are available on Portal.

Your proposal has generated the following comments. Please review and let us know when you would like to schedule a recap conversation with DRT.

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. Question #1 - yes, a development plan public hearing, conditional use and major variance seems to be the primary application. At this time, (as you mentioned) the only variance I'm aware of would involve the retaining wall along the Sheraton service access. It will be too tall, but you will also need a second variance if it is not stepped.

Private easements can be handled outside the city process simply providing proof of resolution or dissolution during the development plan review, however any public easements will need to go through the Easement Vacation Process. These forms can be downloaded from the website without a presubmittal meeting. The utility sign off sheet (signatures needed for each utility) needed for this submittal can also be found online.

-It sounds like your question about the Wildhorse Gondola is as if you're considering doing that as a separate project. Demolition in Steamboat doesn't necessarily need a Development Plan, however because you are in the G zone district you will. Then the only guidance for deciding the type of development plan will be what work will be done in it's place. Likely, yes, it will be administrative, possibly even just a minor modification.

-I'm not sure I understand your questions about substantial conformance they relate to the OSP drop-off parking or the Gondola Square Garage access. Are you thinking along the lines of critical improvements? Substantial conformance is designed to allow changes to an approved



project without completely redoing the Development Plan review and approval process.

2. Question #2 - Yes, "Transit Station" is the appropriate Use classification. This will cover the entirety of the GTC project.

3. Question #3 - There would be no additional permits or approvals needed from the planning department for the geothermal or shuttle systems.

4. Question #4 - Regarding the ADA berth along the Sheraton Driveway, it DOES seem a bit cumbersome to the user, and possibly problematic as the shuttle would have to reverse back into the roundabout. Presumably delivery trucks back into the drive and then pull out head first, but this movement would not work with a shuttle where the ADA access is on the right hand side. Without getting into the nitty gritty of grading, the easiest option might be to have a variable grade through the shuttle dropoff. It's basically 1:20 now, but you could get your most northern berth down to 2% (for say 40') and that would just push up the remaining grade from 5% to 6%, so you wouldn't have accessibility (without handrails along the length), but you'd have an ADA path of travel from the dropoff heading North.

5. Question #5 - Staff do not have any concerns about the relocated parking garage access

6. Question #6 - I think the median is a preferable design to eliminate conflict with northbound busses leaving the GTC. The 90 degree parking design does not allow space for pulling in and backing out without crossing the centerline. Since this will act more like a road for the buses than a parking lot, the angled parking and median division should help to prevent bottlenecks and collisions.

7. Question #7 - It would seem that the use of those parking spaces can only be handled through signage and enforcement, although with so many tourists, any sort of strict enforcement and "training" will only be effective on a limited number of locals.

8. Question #8 - It does look tight considering people tend to queue away from the direction of travel (in this case to the south) which could bottleneck as it gets towards the gondola planter. In this case though I think the primary pedestrian path of travel will be along the southern side of the gondola as people will avoid the loading lines on the north as to come and go from their buses to gondola square.

9. Question #9 - Strictly, I don't think you can, nor would it be appropriate to meet the landscape standards, as this project exists IN the ROW as well as crosses so many boundaries. So in the request for variance from landscape standards, I would do two things. Set your limit of work and do a quick analysis of the existing conditions vs the proposed condition. This will help staff, Planning Commission and City Council have an idea of the net change in condition. Also, and maybe most importantly, I would emphasize and reference the pedestrian circulation

and capacity diagrams. This is a transit center that has very unique needs (moving people the highest priority) so having adequate circulation is the most important. If the residual space is then planting, as it appears, I would say you've maximized planting as much as possible. Of course we can look at planting density as well, but with limited planting, I expect we would look for a fairly lush and dense plan as shown.

10. Question #10 - unless you are proposing optionally proposing fencing, I do not see where this design would require buffering screening or fencing, so this section would not apply.

11. Question #11 - Yes, you will be subject to Tree Preservation Criteria as this entire site qualifies as "particularly viewable from public areas".

12. Question #12 - Lighting in the G zone district must be white. Lights should also have full shielding and be directed downward. There is a strong ethic to reduce light pollution, so while the code does not give recommended footcandle measurements, keeping closer to the .5-1.0 fc in pedestrian areas where we can meet safety, but not over illuminate is preferential. Understandably roadways, and probably gondola loading areas need much more for safety.

13. Question #13 - I don't think that consideration for the functioning of those loading areas is out of the question, however we would not mandate a scope increase in order to capture and change any existing conditions not already within the scope of the proposed project.

14. Question #15 - Staff will outline critical improvements prior to opening. These usually include water and sewer infrastructure, street infrastructure, drainage improvements, stormwater treatment facilities, sidewalk improvements, trail improvements and revegetation

15. Question #16 - Principally we don't usually care about construction phasing, but only phased plans that may or may not ever be complete (think a multiple building housing development). We want to review phased plans to make sure the appropriate and necessary public improvements come in the initial phase. In this unique case however, I think it may be of interest to have a conversation about phasing and building permits so that we would have the capacity to approve pieces of the project.

16. Question #17 - Clear vision setbacks come from Engineering standards and relate to vehicular travel, not pedestrian or bike intersections. I don't see any planting verges on your plan where this would apply.

17. Question #18 - It will be up to you as the applicant for making the case as to why (if you're rebuilding the wall) it cannot (or should not) be brought into compliance. I think there is a case to be made, but at this time I won't weigh in on whether or not we can support this.

18. Question #19 - I would say the Top terminal of the Gondola would be considered your



principal structure. However, as mentioned before, unless you're breaking this into a phased project (not construction phasing, but phased on funding over several years, creating discrete sections that can stand alone) none of this will really apply.

19. Question #20 - Yes, you will be exempt from open space standards based on the G zoning.

20. Question #21 & 22 - Commercial and Mixed-Use Building Design Standards do not apply in G zoning. For the bridge as well as all other accessory structures, Base Area Design Standards will apply.

21. This site tends to generate a lot of non point source pollutants. Was there any exploration into possible pretreatment methods prior to underground conveyance?

22. I understand the traffic study is coming, but this is obviously a significant shift in traffic patterns. Is the increase in the left turn load from Mt. Werner to Mt Werner significant enough to cause any problems?

23. Irrigation is required by code for required landscapes. I discussed in another response a probably variance, but I would assume a safe assumption would be to irrigate the plantings you do have unless you are seeking an additional variance.

24. As a ROW/Road, I think we would still try our best to meet street tree standards. The west side of the bus drop off area seems to be one place in particular that could have trees, and possibly there could be tree plantings in select planter locations to the East. Falling short of the street standards would be a discussion with Engineering and possibly an engineering variance.

25. The tree planters in front of the Grand aren't large enough to support healthy canopy trees. If you're already rebuilding some (or all) I'd suggest exploring making the new ones much larger.

26. It's unclear how the pedestrian areas will be drained.

27. When looking at construction phasing, we will likely want to discuss erosion control and possible cover crop seeding (annual rye grass or something) during the long duration of this project.

28. Identify where bike parking will go and (while we won't have any specific number) consider what you think is the appropriate capacity at this transit center.

Utilities-Mount Werner Review (Reviewed By: Beau Cahill)



1. Identify all utility crossing conditions and ensure Mount Werner Water specs are met. Also make sure separation between water and sanitary lines meets regulations/spec.
2. Please provide more detail information for reason extending sewer main up to northern roundabout with cap.
3. Make sure all abandonments of existing mains, service lines, FH's are completed in accordance with MWW specifications.
4. Fire Hydrant locations will need sign off from the Fire Department. All Hydrants must be new, confirm location/abandonment hydrant M41, located on eastern edge of roundabout with Mt. Werner Rd and Apres Ski Way
5. Ensure new 8" water main a part of the Amble project, coming off the proposed main in the GTC and wrapping around the Amble and connecting into Mt. Werner Road on the west side of the Grand lot, does not conflict with the gondola turn station.

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.

Sincerely,

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

Jeremy Brown, PLA, LEED AP
Planner