



April 30, 2024

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

Re: Riverfront Park at 282677001

Dear Steamboat Engineering And Design (SEAD),

This letter shall serve as the Development Review Team letter (DRT) for PL20240033 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each comment or formally request an extension within 30 days of the date of this letter or the application may be withdrawn.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. Is there an elevation certificate approved for the structures? Or can we confirm they were elevated 1' above the base flood elevation? If not, while the building forms are existing, should any aggregate work applied for in the building permit process meet the substantial improvement criteria (50% or great of the assessed value of the structure; in many cases the assessed value of the structure is just \$120-\$150K). Then the applicant of the building permit will need to go through the Floodplain Development Permit Process. So in my example, any construction cost at or above \$60-\$75K (depending on the assessed value) will need an FDP. Please direct applicants to Bob Keenan.
2. Your Parking Analysis Land Use assumptions on page one of the analysis do not relate to you plans. Sheet A-1 identifies about 7K sq ft of warehousing vs the 17K sq ft in the report (as just one example). The report also neglects the actual DP application proposing the additional (currently illegal) dwelling units. The purpose of this DP and review of the plan is to make the appropriate accommodations for these illegal operations, therefore must be addressed in the parking analysis. Given the proposed parking spaces are inside (or in front of) the residential live/work units, it is also inappropriate to group any shared parking strategy (as no visitor to excel gymnastics for example would be able to utilize these spaces when residents are away at work during the day). Please also explain your operational methodology where a unit has 4 parking spaces within and in front of their garage (how do two units share those 4 spaces?). Unit 9 for example would require 1.5 spaces for the illegal unit, and 1 space for the deed restricted unit, however they are showing this property as contributing 4 spaces to the overall count. This project's parking study needs to be broken down on a unit by unit basis as this residential is isolated and can no longer be taken into an overall shared parking strategy. Should any required residential parking overflow into a "common parking lot" then those spaces may be incorporated into a separate study that looks at shared parking with Building 1.
3. It was determined by planning that the ground floor height of 14' min. is not legal non-conforming as it was never legally established, however would be reviewed and qualify as a mezzanine by planning standards (since it was constructed independent of the original floor plate structure and have occupancy of less than 10 people). Please adjust any comments regarding this in your drawings and narrative accordingly.
4. Required landscaping must be irrigated. (402.D.1.b)
5. Please include a plant list with species and size.
6. You have identified the 15' frontage landscaping in your notes, however I do not see any identified new or existing frontage landscaping along Shield Drive.
7. Your notes reference meeting the interior landscape standards with Category B, but it is not clear where or how you are calculating or meeting this.
8. You have wrapped your interior parking lot landscaping around the edge of the parking area. Allowable forms include interior islands, end islands, corner projections, and interior strips (Table 402-4 and 402-5)
9. Internal sidewalks required per Article 417.
10. Identify open space 421.D
11. why does unit 2 have no parking illustrated in the site plan, but appears to have a garage? also, as a comment towards the separation of the residential and commercial parking plans, this



unit obviously need unique consideration as well. The office alone (parking study aside) would require 5 spaces by CDC standards, then 3.5 for the two large residential units (or 8.5 total spaces for Unit 2 alone).

12. While it is nice to understand what is the "garage" for the purposes of calculating gross square footage, it will just count towards the residential component.

13. Staff have realized that the square footage of the garages are not legally nonconforming as they were part of the original Industrial piece. Garages ARE counted in gross square footage, and none of the units will be able to remain under the 1400 sf threshold when adding the garage to the square footage of the original unit. This appears that it may require a major variance. Staff will discuss and follow up.

15. Is unit 4 proposing a single 2900 sf residential unit? or is this two units?

16. Accessory use (i mostly think you're identifying storage) is just part of residential. In all cases, this "accessory use" area will be included in the gross square footage calculation

17. Unit 8: is this warehouse an existing (approved) use?

18. Unit 9: residential on the 1st and 2nd floor doesn't appear to meet the criteria for a dwelling unit (kitchen and bathroom)

19. floorplan in the lower left hand corner of each architectural page is labeled as "1st level" when it should be 3rd level.

GIS Review (Reviewed By: Colten Yoast)

1. Units and sub addresses will need to be addressed please contact my office. 970-871-8229

Engineering Review (Reviewed By: Adan Camano)

1. C1: Include additional linework for Yampa River Core Trail.

2. C1: Is this Yampa River Core Trail?

3. C1: Include existing concrete walkways

4. C1: Include existing concrete walkways

5. C1: Include existing concrete walkways

6. C1: Include existing dumpster enclosure

7. C1: There is an additional existing culvert here that comes off perpendicular from the entrance. The exit point can be seen on site, but I was not able to locate where the entry point was. My guess is on the other side of the driveway, but could not verify.

8. C1: There is an existing pipe that is discharging water at this location. I wasn't able to determine where it was collecting it from. Possibly from Unit 1's roof drain, but I could not confirm

9. C1: Existing landscape rock. Appears to be 1'-2' tall.

10. C1: Area between the landscape rock and the patio's of the units appears to be a swale that discharges into the Ex. Water Quality Pond.

11. C2: Per drainage letter submitted with these plans, these parking spaces are to be heated. If so, please add that to the callout.

12. C2: There are 3 irrigation vaults at this location. Please reconsider this as a viable location for snow storage.

13. C1: Existing rock-lined ditch. Seems to be a short run of ditch that leads me to believe it travels to the entry point of the culvert on the other side of the driveway.
14. - Consider replacing the existing HDPE that outfalls to Yampa River as it is significantly damaged. Drainage Letter, Recommendations, Page 4.
15. - Consider updating the WQ pond to current standards in preparation for future development. (100-yr storm event, should be a priority when Future Expansion Parcel is developed.). Drainage Letter, Recommendations, Page 4.
16. Please mention the proposed change in zoning from Industrial to Commercial Services. Drainage Letter, Current and Proposed Conditions, Page 3.
17. Consider updating the WQ pond due to future improvements and updated standards for 100-yr events. At least add it to the recommendations.
18. DR1: Please include the concrete walkways with gravel landscape on the plan and consider adjusting calculations.
19. DR1: Please include the concrete walkways with gravel landscape on the plan and consider adjusting calculations.
20. DR1: Please include the concrete walkways with gravel landscape on the plan and consider adjusting calculations.
21. DR1: There is a pipe discharging water near this location. The amount of water coming out was very minor. Please consider if this should be considered for OS flow contributions.
22. DR1: Please include existing culvert. See comments on Existing Conds. Plan, C1.
23. C1: Site Plan is also called Sheet #1. Please update both plans.
24. C2: Please update sheet # to be different from existing conds. plan.

Utilities-City Review (Reviewed By: Amber Gregory)

1. Show the water main and services on the plan

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 Building Department has many open code compliance cases on this property with illegal work done and illegal residential units created without permits, however we have no comments on this application other than setting a condition on this application that all open code violations will need to be resolved once we know the outcome of this application.
- Tap fees must be paid for all undocumented work.
- Units and sub addresses need to be addressed before building permits are issued. Please contact my office at 970-871-8229.
- Approval of this Development Plan is conditional upon the approval of the CMA and ZMA associated with this parcel that would rezone said project to CS zoning
- Deed restrictions in accordance with the original development plan (DP-05-13 and FDP-05-14) conditions of approval must be recorded.



- A trail easement between the live/work buildings and the river must be recorded in accordance of the original development plan conditions of approval prior to final approval of this development plan.
- Any legal nonconforming uses must be registered prior to scheduling the PC hearing

Sincerely,

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

Jeremy Brown
Planner