



April 30, 2024

Brian Hanlen
PO Box 2749
Basalt, CO 81621

Re: Butcherknife Canyon Annexation Concept Review at NO ADDRESS FOUND

Dear Brian Hanlen,

This letter shall serve as the Development Review Team letter (DRT) for PL20240095. This letter is available on Portal. This letter concludes the Concept Review of this project. However, the DRT is available for a meeting to discuss these comments.

As this application is for Concept Review, there shall be no real or implied approval or denial of a project as a result of this application. Statements made by the Development Review Team during the Concept Review are statements of opinion and are not intended to establish final positions or conclusions on the part of the City.

Please feel free to contact me at (970) 871-8260 or by email at bkeenan@steamboatsprings.net with any questions or concerns.

Planning Review (Reviewed By: Bob Keenan, AICP)

1. General:

- Petition for annexation shall be submitted to the City Clerks Office when you are ready to do so.
- Submit a Zone Map Amendment concurrent with the Annexation application..
- As this application is for Concept Review we will not provide comment on the submitted Draft Annexation Agreement or the Annexation Plat. The Annexation Agreement and Annexation Plat will be reviewed with the submittal of an Annexation application or petition for annexation, as applicable.
- Provide a Water Demand Report and Traffic Study with Annexation application.

2. Suitability for Development – Provide more information on the suitability of the land for development. Including preliminary grading plans and usable lot area analysis.

3. Provide more information on the type and location of neighborhood amenities proposed for this development with your Annexation application.

4. Provide information with future submittal regarding current public road maintenance adjacent to the annexed area and how this might change by inclusion of these adjacent lands into the City jurisdiction.

5. Zoning –

- Staff continues to support the proposed land use designations as contained in the Comp Plan which is RO zoning for the developable portions of the property and OR zoning for Butcherknife Canyon and along Amethyst Drive. The area along Amethyst Drive appears to be include steep slopes that may not be suitable for development. This area is also identified in the Comp Plan as being part of the Strawberry Park Planning area which includes provisions for limited development and preservation of scenic and rural qualities.
- As noted above, Staff does not support RN-3 zoning. RN-3 has no maximum lot size and may not create enough density to limit large lots/homes as proposed in your narrative.
- Future submittal shall include minimum densities proposed including secondary units.
- Consider incorporating a mix of housing types as proposed in the Comp Plan.
- Considerations for workforce or affordable housing should be included in your proposal.

6. Site Planning-

- Provide a conceptual subdivision layout and proposed lot sizes and densities. Include preliminary grading, utility plan, and street/alley network plans.
- How do you achieve the number of units proposed on your illustrative site plan? Is that through duplexes, secondary units, or multi-family buildings?
- Provide information regarding what is proposed for existing structures on the subject property.
- Including developable area along the northeast part of Parcel B that extends into the Open Space/Recreation area as designated on the Future Land Use Plan appears to be a minor change and could be supportable.
- Site plans and annexation plat should include parcel sizes.

7. Narrative

- We don't believe we will need an Economic Impact Analysis with future submittal of an Annexation application as noted in the narrative but a Fiscal Impact Analysis.
- No sidewalk is proposed along Strawberry Park Road we assume this to be County Rd 36 – this will be evaluated with a subdivision proposal but generally speaking the project should include sidewalks along all streets.
- Narrative refers to parcel #s that do not correspond to any map provided.
- With future submittal we suggest you provide more detailed analysis of:
 - Advantages vs. disadvantages of the proposal per annexation criterion 4.
 - How the project will minimize adverse impacts. Particularly on wildlife and water quality, annexation criterion 5.
 - How the project meets annexation criterion 6, inclusion of affordable housing.
- Staff does not find that the proposed Community Plan Amendment to change the future land use designations as being compatible with the preferred directions and policies of the Comp Plan. More specifically, the development of the western portion of the property appears to conflict with the minimum densities and neighborhood character that the Comp Plan is seeking. Regarding the Amethyst Drive proposal, Staff finds that it is out of compliance with the preservation of sensitive area direction of the plan and may conflict with the goals of the



Strawberry Park specific planning area.

- Given the above, Staff does not support the proposed rezoning.

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

1. Not enough information to perform a review. See planning comments.

External Agency Review (Reviewed By: Bob Keenan, AICP)

1. Please see attached letters from Colorado Parks and Wildlife and Routt County Planning Department.

Historic Preservation Review (Reviewed By: Caitlin Berube-Smith)

1. If this property were annexed, and likely through preceding agreements, any existing structure over 50 years of age would be formally evaluated and determined if they meet the criteria for consideration as eligible resources for listing to the Steamboat Springs Register of Historic Places.

Please confirm if any structures on the following parcels are over 50 years of age and are proposed to be, demolished following potential annexation and through proposed development:

- Parcel #1 - 3.32 acres, a legal non-conforming site with multiple residential & agricultural structures
- Parcel #2 - 1.18 acres, a legal non-conforming property with a residential structure & small agricultural structures
- Parcel #3 – 2.28 acres, a non-conforming property with no improvements
- Parcel #4 – 17.36 acres, a non-conforming property with agricultural structures, public utility lines, the Butcherknife Trail, and the Woodchuck Irrigation Ditch

2. Staff does not find that the proposed Community Plan Amendment to change the future land use designations as being compatible with the preferred directions and policies of the Comp Plan. As staff continues to support the proposed land use designations as contained in the Comp Plan which is RO zoning, proposed development should align with goals and policies for Old Town, as identified in the Comp Plan.

More specifically, the following goals/policies listed below, in addition to all of the goals and policies in Chapter 11-Historic Preservation, are not compatible as they relate to cultural resource protection, maintaining the character of existing neighborhood/zone district, historic preservation, adaptive reuse of historic/cultural resources, rural character preservation, preservation of open lands:

NS-4.1

LU-1.1

LU-2

ED-3.1

SPA-1

SPA-1.1

SPA-1.2

SPA-1.3

3. Consider meeting some of the incompatible goals/policies listed above by retaining any historically significant, eligible resources, and adaptively reusing them for the following:

- Considerations for adaptive reuse as workforce or affordable housing
- Considerations for adaptive reuse serving as options for other neighborhood amenities

4. Please consider compatibility with the Future Land Use Plan, that identify 5 major themes, of which two are: 1. Preservation of important open lands, 2. Rural Character Preservation. Preservation and adaptive reuse of any historic eligible resource structures on the subject parcels is important in meeting these two themes and overall compatibility.

Legal Department Review (Reviewed By: Jennifer Bock)

1. -Section 9(b): Because the Petitioners are not requesting TND zoning, there will not be a regulating plan, and this should be deleted from this section.

-Section 10(a): Note to Petitioners that the City must first pass an annexation ordinance before passing zoning and subdivision; these can occur at the same Council meeting, but annexation must be approved first on the agenda.

Parks and Recreation Review (Reviewed By: Craig Robinson)

1. • The proposed donation of the Butcherknife Canyon area to the City may be a beneficial process to help protect these conservation values for the public today and into the future. The donation process may involve going through Parks and Recreation Commission with next steps to be further investigated.

- If the donation does not occur, the City would like to formalize the trail easement which may not exist for the trail portion across the subject parcel.
- Staff supports the vision of improving connectivity for alternative modes of transportation through the parcel and to the adjacent properties.

Utilities-City Review (Reviewed By: Amber Gregory)

1. The city water and sewer department cannot approve of annexation without a development plan and water demand report. In order for the city to either accept or deny annexation, a development plan needs to be proposed. The city cannot offer any guidance to the applicant without a conceptual layout.



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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Bob L Keenan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Bob" and last name "Keenan" clearly legible, and a middle initial "L" in between.

Bob Keenan, AICP
Principal Planner