



February 28, 2024

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

Re: Riverfront Park PUD - CPA at 1920 BRIDGE LN

Dear Steamboat Engineering And Design (SEAD),

This letter shall serve as the Development Review Team letter (DRT) for PL20230259 Submittal #2. 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. A DRT Meeting with applicable agencies is required prior to Submittal #3.

Please address each comments 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that adequately addresses each comment within 14 days of the date of this letter (3/13/24) or the application may be withdrawn.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

Planning Review (Reviewed By: Jeremy Brown)

6. Please list and address with responses the 5 criteria from the SSACP. You have roughly responded to these, but they should be more direct responses to ensure every criteria is covered. For example criteria #1 is "The existing Area Community Plan and/or any related element thereof is in need of the proposed amendment". You have not addressed in your narrative why this is a need (and of course this response should be a need not based on any of the compliance issues). Your response to SSACP Criteria 3 states that the site is already developed however part of the site is UNdeveloped and this should be addressed. It's also about what COULD happen (even if presently developed on way) and potential impacts on this site because of the change to the FLUM.



7. Under your first narrative response, you say "the cpa is proposing changing the current site zoning from Industrial to CS" This should say "Mixed Use Corridor". Remember this application is 100% about the future land use map. There are some places where you have referenced "CS" as part of the ZMA application, and generally that is fine if you are referencing the ZMA accurately, but keep in mind you should make your case based on "mixed use corridor" and be able to write this entire narrative without the reference to CS (as that is how council is supposed to be reviewing it)

8. You have listed the Criteria 724.C.2.a but you have not responded to it.

9. In your 724.C.2.b response you mention that the property "fits the (Mixed-Use Corridor) definition remarkably well", however the criteria is about stating how this piece of land at this location would be compatible with the preferred direction. Part of the site is undeveloped, and the rest of it can theoretically be redeveloped, so we aren't taking into consideration how it is currently (and illegally) being used. Briefly put, but want to understand if this FLUM change at this site is principally aligned with the SSACP. Taking that further, like when you list the Goals and policies, you will want to have a written explanation of how this site's FLUM change would further the goal or policy. (Like for Policy LU-1.1, how is MUC more integrated or more compatible of a land use than Industrial? explain.)

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.

- The CPA is conditional on the approval of the ZMA application #PL20240028

Sincerely,

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

Jeremy Brown, PLA, LEED AP
Planner