

March 11, 2024

City of Steamboat Springs Planning and Community Development
124 10th Street
Steamboat Springs, CO 80487

Reference: Riverfront Park
Response to DRT Comments dated 02/28/2024 – Community Plan Amendment
Submittal (PL20230259)
1900, 1920, 1940, 1955, and 1960 Bridge Lane
Steamboat Springs, CO 80487

Dear Planning Department,

Please accept this letter as a response to the comments generated from the Development Review Team (DRT) dated February 28, 2024. The comments from the DRT are in response to the Community Plan Amendment project narrative – project PL20230259. The comment from the DRT has been copied below in italics with a response following.

“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 not be a need 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 the way) and potential impacts on this site because of the change to the FLUM.”

The narrative has been revised to include all 5 listed criteria with responses.

“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 reference to CS (as that is how council is supposed to be reviewing it)”

The narrative has been revised to address the mixed use corridor.

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

The narrative has been revised with a response to Criteria 724.C.2.a added.

“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)."

The narrative has been revised to further explain how this site's FLUM change would not only align with the goals and policies, but further the goals and policies.