



May 11, 2024

Walter Magill  
1769 BROME DRIVE  
STEAMBOAT SPRINGS, CO 80487

**Re: Village Drive Apartments - Development Plan at 142500001**

**Walter Magill,**

This letter shall serve as the Development Review Team letter (DRT) for PL20240114 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each comment or formally request an extension within 30 days of the date of this letter or the application may be withdrawn.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) 871-8280 or by email at [tstauffer@steamboatsprings.net](mailto:tstauffer@steamboatsprings.net) with any questions or concerns.



**Building Department Review** (Reviewed By: Todd Carr)

1. Please see our comments to help with future design submittals, upon us receiving back comments we will then be able to provide more detailed responses per proposed building to help your design team out, currently it appears we may have one building under the IRC and another under the IBC, so this will be reflected on how we review this project moving forward

2. Your code study sheets on Sheet A0.00 references the Texas Accessibility Code, this will not be allowed to be used in Colorado or Routt County, please remove this from the drawings. In Routt County we follow Chapter 11 of the 2021 IBC for new construction and also for Existing Buildings in combination with the 2021 IEBC that will reference the 2021 IBC accordingly dependent upon the scope of work, additionally the 2021 IBC utilizes the Fair Housing to some degree for new construction for certain design standards in combination with the DOJ 2010 ADA manual. Please note it is possible maybe the Texas Accessibility Standards may be more stringent than our local codes we follow or equal to them, which is fine, but on paper we need to reference our local adopted codes and you are welcome to exceed these if desired. The 2021 IBC chapter 11 will reference ADA units as Type A or Type B units, and has certain requirements for each type of unit that you will want to review, then on the next round of submittals please let us know how many of each type of unit you will be providing, also see next comment about Occupancy Type as you call this R-3 but if this is designed under the 2021 IBC this building will be an R-2 Occupancy as R-3 is defined as only 2 dwelling units, 3-dwelling units in a single building or more are to be classified as R-2 Occupancy.

3. Occupancy Use Type: You call this R-3 but if this is designed under the 2021 IBC this building will be an R-2 Occupancy as R-3 is defined as only 2 dwelling units, 3-dwelling units in a single building or more are to be classified as R-2 Occupancy. Please make this change on the plans.

4. You have listed the 2021 International Residential Code and the 2021 International Building Code, Please further explain which code is to be used per building to help us with this preliminary review so we can provide back good comments and understand if one of the buildings will be built as townhomes under the IRC, while the other as R-2 Condos or Apartments under the IBC, thank you in advance.

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

1. C2: Stamp?
2. C3: To be constructed with this development.
3. C3: IPA proposed to be one way? How will vehicles be limited to clockwise travel. Based on the design, 2-way would be preferred.
4. C3: Access easement required to be dedicated for sidewalk located outside of public right-of-way.
5. C3: Sidewalk measures 6ft. 8ft required.
6. C5: The valley pan is of significant length. Consider adding an inlet and pipe.
7. C5: Sidewalk cross slope required to meet ADA of max. 2%.

8. C5: Minimum horizontal curve 61'.
9. C4: Drainage easements required for water quality treatment facilities.
10. C4: Outfall will need to be managed by a level spreader or similar to reintroduce water via sheet flow, maintaining historic drainage patterns.
11. Drainage Study: Approved Scope missing.
12. Traffic Study: Approved scope missing?

**Planning Review** (Reviewed By: Toby Stauffer, AICP)

1. 214.B: the existing building does not appear to be setback from the front property line 15'. Revise the concept or request a variance. The parking lot setback is not met for main building parking space #15.

214.B: Show existing grade, overall height, plate height and average plate height on all elevations, all buildings, show average plate height measurements and calculations.

2. A0.00, A-1.01, A2.04:: see mark ups

Gross lot Area is inconsistent between existing conditions and architectural plans, please revise. The architectural site plan appears to be inconsistent with several other plans in the DP and PP and the narrative. Please ensure all documents are accurate or only provide one site plan to serve all projects.

3. 402.D.1 General Landscaping: Proposed trees along the south property line appear to be within 10 ft of the proposed sewer main. Moving the main could preserve existing trees in the area, or provide more space for proposed trees to buffer the impacts of this development from the adjacent property.

402.D.2 Frontage Landscaping: Some frontage plantings along Walton Creek Road are shown within the ROW. All plantings should be located on private property.

Provide some frontage landscaping in front of Building I, Building I parking, and Building I garages on Village Drive.

402.D.6 Parking Lot Landscaping: Consider providing shrubs, trees, or taller plantings to screen parking spaces for Building I.

4. 403 Buffering: Consider maintaining existing vegetation on the south property line to mitigate impacts from the development on the adjacent property. Consider providing additional landscaping along west property line to buffer this development from adjacent property. Consider providing additional landscaping along south property line to buffer this development from adjacent property.

5. 404 Revegetation/Tree Preservation: The variance to tree preservation standards will be included and processed with the subdivision application and the development plan application. The narrative for 719.D.3 indicates other standards are improved by approving this variance,

indicate which CDC standards are improved. Clarify the narrative to indicate if any existing trees will remain or if all existing trees and vegetation will be removed. If any trees/vegetation will remain, indicate the existing trees to remain on the site plan and the landscape plan. Include additional information about alternatives that were evaluated to maintain existing trees and what was considered to mitigate impacts and address 719.D.1. The future land use classification also calls for landscape buffers to help new development transition to existing development. Address how this project is consistent with the future land use classification. The variance needs additional justification for 719.1 and 719.3 to demonstrate how this variance meets the criteria. Maintaining some trees or planting additional trees could mitigate impacts and help this project better meet standards and criteria and be more consistent with the purpose of the standard.

6. 405 Lighting: The lighting plan provided is incomplete. Include a photometric plan and exterior fixture information for site lighting and building lighting; indicate how lighting will meet standards of the section.

7.406, Parking: see markups on A0.00- calculations need to be revised, 1 parking space short of required amount.

406.C.7: Bike parking is required and should be provided and shown on the site plans for the project.

8. 408 Refuse Management: Show building, materials, screening, or elevations for trash enclosure. Size/shape of enclosure is inconsistent between site plan and architectural site plan

9. 409 Snow Storage: see document mark ups on C3 Site Plan, some areas do not meet standards and may not be feasible. There is a discrepancy between snow storage numbers on the site plan and architectural site plan, please revise.

10. 412 Critical Improvements: Critical improvements are required with the preliminary plat/subdivision for this property.

11. 413 Phasing: This development is not proposing phasing. All grading, utilities, buildings, improvements, drainage improvements, sidewalks, trails, site features and amenities, and landscaping are required to be complete prior to the first CO and prior to any condo/townhome final plat or sale of any subdivided property smaller than the entire lot.

12. 414 Multi Mode Facilities: Multi mode facilities on the perimeter of this property are provided and also required with the subdivision/ preliminary plat.  
The original dedication of greenbelt/open space easement calls for "perpetual easements to the city over the land for use as greenbelt, open space and non vehicular path" and the



acceptance by the city describes a bike path. To achieve the intent of the original easement and meet standards of this section, a non vehicular public access easement should be dedicated for the sidewalk and soft surface trail proposed with development of this site. The non vehicular public access easement should be dedicated on the preliminary plat.

13. 420 Accessory Structures: ensure that refuse structure and any other accessory structure meet standards of this section.

14. 421: connect the open spaces for contiguity. The open space areas shown on the architectural site plan are inconsistent with the preliminary plat and the site plan for the DP, please revise.

15. Workforce Floor Area: Each of the three buildings in the development is a "Principal Building." To exclude floor area in a principal building, you can exclude a maximum of 18% or 50% of the floor area of workforce units. For all three buildings, calculated independently, the percentage of floor area for the workforce units is less than 18%, so the standard applied for each building is 50% of the floor area of the workforce units. That changes the floor area that can be excluded for workforce units, decreases the amount of floor area that can be excluded, and increases your FAR variance request. see mark ups.

16. FAR Variance: In 719.1 It's unclear in the narrative what impacts to adjacent properties were considered when requesting this variance and how those impacts were mitigated by the project or design. The narrative indicates that the "other" purpose that will be met by this variance is the purpose of the MF zone district- this purpose is the purpose of the FAR standard- so it's unclear what "other" purpose will be improved by this variance. The variance needs additional information for 719.1 and 719 3 to demonstrate how this project meets these criteria. Variance narrative: it's unclear how the 12% calculation is relevant to the request, what it's referring to, or how it was calculated. The request is for 56% or a 6% increase over the required 50% FAR. Provide additional information about the 12% or remove.

17. 437.D Access: Buildings I and II do not meet intent or purpose of this standard. Demonstrate compliance with the standard or request a variance.

18. 437.F Roof forms: The Main Building does not meet the roof form standards, it's unclear if Buildings I and II meet the standards. Provide additional information about the roof forms of Buildings I and II. All three buildings will need to comply or a variance will need to be requested. Indicate if the roofs will retain snow or if not how the roof snow standards will be addressed.

19. 437.G Surface Parking: Surface parking adjacent to Building 1 needs to be screened.  
437.G.5 Garage Standards: Garages for Building I and II do not meet standards b or d.



20. 437.H.4 Glazing: provide glazing calculations for each façade of each building. Demonstrate compliance with these standards or request a variance.

21. 437.J Building Colors: the predominant colors on buildings should be browns, greens, or reds. The predominant colors on Buildings I and II do not meet these standards, it's unclear if the colors meet the standard on the Main Building, it looks like they may not. Please revise. The renderings of Building I and the Main Building are inconsistent with the color of materials shown. Please clarify and provide accurate renderings or accurate material colors.

22. 437.K Mechanical Equipment: The development plan does not show or include any mechanical equipment outside the buildings, on the roof, or on the site. No exterior mechanical equipment will be approved with this DP and any exterior mechanical equipment will need to meet standards of this section and may require another DP in the future.

23. 437.K Accessory/Service Structures: The only accessory structure included in these plans is the trash enclosure, which needs to be shown in architectural plans and needs to meet the standards of this section as well as the refuse management section. No other accessory or service structures will be approved with this DP and any other accessory structures will need to meet standards of this section and may require another DP in the future.

24. The first submittal of this project is missing some information and the quality is such that the expedited review process may be in jeopardy if the second submittal doesn't correct the issues. If the project requires a third submittal or the deadlines in the project schedule are missed, we will move out of the expedited review process and into a standard review process.

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

1. Most corrections and comments are captured in the utility plan mark up; additional corrections, comments and context listed below.
2. Request for Water and Sewer Services form to be signed and returned to MWW by project owners
3. Called out on the utility plan; the proposed sewer main wrapping around the S and W side of the development will be 10". This sewer main will be considered critical infrastructure and will be required to be complete and have received preliminary acceptance prior to service extensions or any issuance of certificate of occupancy.
4. No new trees planted or improvements to be constructed in proposed sewer easement that may impede its use.
5. Plant Investment Fees will be due in full for plumbing fixtures within the building prior to approval of a building permit
6. Provide clarification if fire suppression will be included in the proposed development





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

1. Stacked off-street parking spaces for residential uses shall be assigned to specific dwelling units in a development agreement or other legal recorded document prior to building permit issuance for this development.
2. The applicant shall enter into an agreement, acceptable to the City, restricting the occupancy of the Workforce Units to qualified residents as defined by the Community Development Code. The agreement shall be recorded at the Routt County Clerk and Recorder prior to Certificate of Occupancy/Completion.
3. The proposed 22' roadway is acceptable with a full fire sprinkler and fire alarm system. Any changes require an additional review and approval.
4. Civil construction plans prepared/signed/sealed by a licensed Colorado Professional Engineer are required to be submitted to the RCRBD with a Building Permit/Grading Permit application for review and approval prior to the start of any construction.
5. Access drive, driveway, and parking areas are considered a critical improvement and must be constructed and approved or accepted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy/Completion or approval of a Condo/Townhome Final Plat, whichever occurs first.
6. Drainage improvements are considered a critical improvement and must be constructed and approved or accepted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy/Completion or approval of a Condo/Townhome Final Plat, whichever occurs first.
7. Prior to Engineering Final Approval Inspection, a Completion Letter signed and sealed by a Colorado Professional Engineer (Project Engineer) shall be uploaded to the applicable building permit condition.
8. Permanent storm water quality treatment facilities are considered a critical improvement and must be constructed and approved or accepted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy/Completion or approval of a Condo/Townhome Final Plat, whichever occurs first.
9. Prior to any construction permit issuance, the final signed and sealed drainage study shall be submitted.
10. Sidewalk improvements are considered a critical improvement and must be constructed and approved or accepted prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy/Completion or approval of a Condo/Townhome Final Plat, whichever occurs first.
11. Record Drawings/CAD Files including drainage, PWQTF(s), and sidewalks shall be submitted prior to Final Engineering Site Inspection.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Toby Stauffer", is placed over a faint, light blue circular official stamp.

Toby Stauffer, AICP, Senior Planner