

PL20250300

DRT Comments with [Applicant Responses](#)

10.21.2025

1. Is boiler building legally nonconforming? [An Encroachment Easement Agreement from 2010 is in county records at Reception Number 703457. It's been called out on the site plan.](#)
2. Your narrative states that the parking lot side of the "tiny homes" does not have residential in the pedestrian active building frontage. While garages are exempt from the gsf calculation, they are still considered a residential component of the building and are therefor. That being said, staff do not feel as though the parking lot side of the building is a "pedestrian circulation area" and therefor exempt. Staff are generally willing to support this design, however the crux of the narrative should focus on supporting residential on the core trail side using a different argument. [Narrative has been updated](#)
3. The narrative addresses fencing that could not be found in any planset. [Fencing areas were added to plans We are requesting that the fencing plan be considered an "alternative fencing plan". We do not wish for any part of the fencing to be a required portion of the DP, but we would like the ability to erect fencing without further approvals. We do not believe that the fencing itself satisfies any specific standards, however, if it is conditional to approvals of any Conditional Use or Variance request, we are open to requiring specific areas of fencing. We are simply asking that you also approve a comprehensive plan for fencing, portions of which will remain optional as we move forward with project completion. Please indicate areas where the CDC indicates specific areas of fencing would be required for approval of the DP, if any.](#)
4. Please provide a percentage of the ground floor footprint that has a ground floor height in excess of 14' and the percentage that does not. [This information was added to the Variance Exhibits on Page A6.](#)
5. On page A5 is appears as though all garage doors on the riverfront building have been included in the glazing calculation (dashed orange) however only 50% of the doors are identified as glazing. Please confirm or clarify. [The calculation was accurate, but the dashed orange lines surrounding the non-glazed garage doors have been removed.](#)
6. Staff do not support the glazing variance request as proposed. Staff believe there may be support for a reduction along the Western facade given the privacy concerns. Staff do not find support for glazing reduction along the Eastern facade at this time. To provide some relief to this calculation, the "buildings beyond" which you note as "ends of deck and other units" or the neighboring living room do not need to be used in to overall facade calculation. [The glazing variance request has been updated - see page A6 for the Variance Exhibit.](#)
7. Informational Comment: While staff appreciate the parking calculations for theoretical commercial, and appreciate the additional parking, this note is to acknowledge this approval is not necessarily approving any commercial uses at this time. [Understood, expected, and we're in agreement. This information was for demonstration purposes only.](#)
8. Show/Confirm compliance with 26' min. Frontage Height on "tiny homes". Currently the only measurement provided is for the top floor of attic storage at 24.1' [The lowest Frontage Height is 26', and the measurement has been added to page A-2 on the front elevation.](#)
9. Drawing C8 Note 2 says "cutsheets for proposed lighting fixtures included as attachments with this submittal". No attachments could be found. [A cut sheet has been added to the lighting plan](#)
10. CDC 402.D.1.b Automatic Irrigation required. [Added general requirements to landscaping plan.](#)
11. Plant Schedule required. [Update to show plant schedule](#)
12. Underlay proposed utilities plan on Landscape plan. It appears as though two ornamentals may be on top of a Sewer Main. [Updated to show \(and avoid\) utility mains](#)

13. It appears as though the deciduous tree layer is not turned on. The plan has been updated to show existing deciduous trees. Many of the existing native trees along the river were previously counted toward the required landscaping for the neighboring parcel under DP PL20240033. While verifying their "Existing Landscaping" exhibit, we identified some discrepancies between the documented and actual count and placement of those trees. We have therefore conducted our own inventory of the existing landscaping along the river. Any plantings found to be **in excess** of what was shown on the prior plan have been counted toward the landscaping required for this development. These updates are reflected on the Landscaping Plan.

14. Sheet 11.C footnote states "we plan to clear some of the shrubs near the river but will not surpass 54 shrubs or 18 plantings". The development shown in the site plan would not require a floodplain development permit, however the clearing of shrubs will. Please confirm if this is your intention so the appropriate guidance may be given and conditions added. Also, as it is written, is unclear if you are "removing no more than 54 shrubs" (with an undetermined remainder), or plan to "remove shrubs, leaving at minimum 54 shrubs". Please clarify. We have removed that note on the plans and shown existing shrubs on the site. We do not plan to remove any existing shrubs, however there are some trees, in excess of the requirement, that we do hope to remove for structural safety and in order to install the required stormwater treatment facility. It is our understanding that we will need a floodplain development permit for these improvements, and your guidance would be very helpful in this respect.

15. Please identify the 21,260 sf number you are using for planting. At 2.1 acres for the proposed site, and around 30,000sf of proposed site development, the interior landscape number should be around 60,000 sf. The landscaping plan has been updated to more clearly indicate what area is being counted towards the interior landscaping area and why.

16. Bike racks required CDC 406.C.7 **Bike Racks were added**

17. Provide details or architecturals for the trash enclosure. We have removed the trash structure and have instead indicated on the plans that each townhome will provide their own trash and recycling roll-off bins. We have provided a turning radius plan for a large vehicle and one possible placement plan for the bins that has been approved by Twin Enviro.

18. The Phasing plan doesn't make it clear when all landscape will be provided. Also, please note, CDC 413.C.1.d "The phasing plan shall include the following improvements with the first phase:...landscaping adjacent to required sidewalk and trail connections" We've pre-checked and provided a new phasing plan with this submittal.

19. Development Plan PL20240033 requires 3,341 sf of snow storage on this subject property (there is no snow melt on 57 spaces according to the development plan). Please show or account for this. The parking spaces along the Eastern flank of the existing development are the only ones requiring snow storage, as the remainder of the existing paved area has a snowmelt system per PL20240033. This area is 4,246 sf of pavement. Per CDC 409.D, a minimum of 50% of that area must be provided as snow storage, plus another 25% reduction due to the elevation of the site. This results in a required 1,591 sf of snow storage. 1,730sf of snow storage has been provided within the Interior Parking Lot Landscaping area surrounding these parking spaces.

20. Postal Facilities required CDC 424 **Postal Facilities have been added**

21. CDC 437.D.1 Buildings shall prioritize orientation or primary pedestrian entries to... pedestrian circulation. Connections should be shown from units to the trail. Each unit on the core trail has a path from their back gate (in fencing) to the core trail. This is now shown on the plans.

22. Identify slope of all roof pitches. CDC 437.F.1 **Roof Slopes have been added to elevation pages**

23. Informational Comment: multifamily must include recycling service **Confirming this is planned 1:1**

- 24.** Staff do not find the CDC 437.H.2 Townhome variation standard has been met particularly on the tiny homes. The plan has been updated to more strictly reflect two or more specifically listed variation methods as opposed to the previous plan, which drew more minorly from 5 of the 6 methods. "...Individual units shall be differentiated by variations included but not limited to **two or more** of the following methods" (137.H.2.1). Methods and explanations have been added to page A-2.
- 25.** Staff do not find CDC 437.H.3.g has been met to provide visual interest particularly on the important facade facing the trail. Aside from the deck, the Building masses themselves are shear vertical, and the repetitious 2nd/3rd story windows should be varied. 437.H.3.g is a Guideline, and is not required for approval. "400.C.4 ...Guidelines are stated using the terms 'should' or 'may' to indicate they are considered relevant to the purpose but compliance is not required for approval. Guidelines shall be considered when evaluating a Variance or Adjustment to the standard."
- 26.** CDC 437.I.1.b Changes in materials shall occur where wall planes meet at an inside corner..." These areas have been altered for compliance with the standard. On walls where no transition would otherwise be possible, the upper levels of the units will be furred out to create an "overhang" that will provide the required inside corner. These areas have been called out on the plans and will appear similar to the approved transitions utilized on nearly all facades of the MF Buildings at Basecamp at the corner of 40 and Elk River Road.
- 27.** Metal not a permitted Siding Material walls-Ground Story CDC 437.I.1.a and table C-1 Appendix C The Ground Floor has been Updated to Use varying colors of Wood Material on all buildings, some natural and some engineered.
- 28.** Light Cream not an approved Primary Color. This would be closer to "Light tan" which is only an approved accent color (appendix B) In the updated architectural plans, the primary colors are a dark brown and a medium brown, with accents of black and light tan/off white.
- 29.** Please identify Mechanical equipment locations and compliance with 437.K.1 437.K.1 is related to rooftop mechanical equipment, which we will not have. Mechanical equipment for the project will be wall mounted or ground-mounted on or adjacent to rear facades of all buildings, which would fall under the Guideline at 437.K.2. "400.C.4 ...Guidelines are stated using the terms 'should' or 'may' to indicate they are considered relevant to the purpose but compliance is not required for approval. Guidelines shall be considered when evaluating a Variance or Adjustment to the standard."
- 30.** CDC437.K.4.a "trash collection... should be incorporated into the form of the principal building" C437.K.4 is a list of Guidelines, and is not required for approval. "400.C.4 ...Guidelines are stated using the terms 'should' or 'may' to indicate they are considered relevant to the purpose but compliance is not required for approval. Guidelines shall be considered when evaluating a Variance or Adjustment to the standard."
- 31.** Will any work be done to the boiler building (materials, finish, color?) The boiler structure exists within an easement benefiting the neighboring parcel. It is owned and maintained by Riverfront Park of Steamboat Springs LLC, and we have no rights to alter it.
- 32.** please confirm architectural grade asphalt shingles. Confirmed
- 33.** (Site Plan) Informational Note: This stall is a parking island per PL20240033 The previously approved landscape islands are currently still concrete and have not been planted. We have shown them on the Landscape Plan along with their proposed relocated positions. We have provided the same number of plantings as the previously approved plan, and a slightly larger area for those plantings.
- 34.** (Site Plan) Per PL20240033, this space is required interior parking lot plantings that will need to be replanted/accounted for See Comment Response #33 immediately above.

Additional Note to Planner/Staff:

We would love to take you up on your offer to coordinate a meeting with Parks and Recreation to revisit the potential conversion of a portion of the site abutting the Core Trail into a public park, in exchange for vacating the existing trail easement along the river.

This concept has been discussed in the past, and while we are not requesting that it be tied to the approval of this Development Plan, we would like to reopen the conversation. Our intent is to determine whether any minor adjustments to this DP could help *future-proof* the site and facilitate an easier approval process for such an exchange in the future.

documents associated with certain application types may include a qualifying descriptor that only states "For Approval, Not for Construction". For more information regarding applicable submittal items, refer to "Complete Application Information" located on the Planning Department's webpage (<https://www.steamboatsprings.net/1387/Complete-Application-Information>). [Understood and updated.](#)

2. All drainage studies, H&H studies, traffic impact studies, and geotechnical reports shall be signed and sealed by the Engineer, and considered final with no qualifying descriptors, prior to Engineering's review. [Understood and updated.](#)
3. All stamps shall include a date of signature through the seal upon submission. Please update on all applicable sheets. [Understood and updated.](#)
4. (Cover): Remove from all plan sheets and documents. Qualifying descriptor may be present on applicable plan sheets, but must instead state exactly "For Approval, Not for Construction". [Understood and updated.](#)
5. (Existing Conditions): Existing Conditions plan should match what is currently existing, i.e. Riverfront Condos. [Existing conditions plan updated to reveal frozen layers.](#)
6. (Site Plan): Show parking spaces removed where proposed entry is located. [Parking spaces shown as removed.](#)
7. (Site Plan): Provide turning movements to ensure all cars can properly back out of garages. [A vehicle turning analysis for garage access to the requested units is provided in this resubmittal.](#)
8. (Site Plan): Show proposed drainage & access easement for SFDP. [Please see sheet C11 for proposed easements.](#)
9. (Site Plan): Where does this walkway lead to? It also appears to cross over a trail/trail easement. [The soft surface walkway is intended to lead to a common area adjacent to the Yampa river.](#)
10. (Phasing Plan): Include walkway with Phase 1. [Phasing plan has been revised.](#)
11. (Traffic Study): Stamp required without disclaimer. Regardless of application type, all submitted traffic studies shall be considered final. [A stamped traffic study is included in this resubmittal.](#)
12. (Geotech Reports): Remove "Draft". Stamp required without disclaimer. Regardless of application type, all submitted geotech reports shall be considered final. [A new stamped Geotech report is included with this resubmittal.](#)
13. (Drainage Study): Remove "Draft." All drainage studies shall be final at the time of initial submission. [The drainage study has been revised.](#)
14. (Drainage Study): Remove disclaimer. Regardless of application type, all submitted drainage studies shall be considered final. Date stamp. [The drainage study has been revised.](#)
15. (Drainage Study Pg. 3): Show on exhibit. [The viewport has been adjusted to show the existing sedimentation pond.](#)
16. (Drainage Study Pg. 3): This is not what is shown. [DR1 has been revised with additional labeling and flow arrows for clarity.](#)
17. (Drainage Study Pg. 3): This is not Agate Street. [Revised.](#)
18. (Drainage Study Pg. 3): Please show this/confirm that design point can handle drainage. [The original drainage report from CDC and additional explanation in Section 4.0 Proposed conditions are provided as justification.](#)



19. (Drainage Study Pg. 5): DP6 or DP1? [DP6, symbol moved closer to end of storm sewer outfall for clarity.](#)
20. (Drainage Study O&M Plan): Remove disclaimer. Date stamp.
 21. (Drainage Study O&M Plan): Spillway does not appear to be in the correct location based on outflow direction. [The spillway must be located on the north side of the pond because the adjacent grade is higher everywhere else. The spillway elevation will be set higher than the overflow grate for the Type C Inlet. See Grading and Drainage Plan Sheet C4 for the highest level of detail.](#)





Utilities-City Review (Reviewed By: Amber Gregory)

1. The utilities plan does not meet the general allowable conditions of the the City of Steamboat Springs Standards. For instance, A trash enclosure is proposed on top of the sewer manhole and the water main. This is not allowed. [The trash enclosure has been removed.](#) Each unit will have individual roll out bins that will be stored inside of the garages.

[As this utility plan is for a development plan application and not for construction drawings, profiles and lengths between individual fittings have not been provided at this time. Please specify if utility profiles and lengths between individual fittings will be required for this development plan application.](#)

Parks and Recreation Review (Reviewed By: Matthew Barnard)

1. Asphalt driveway and riprap spillway (southeast of Boiler Building) encroach on trail easement. [Asphalt and rip rap have been removed from trail easement. Please note that all fencing and drainage features are proposed outside of the trail easement.](#)

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

- o The following items are considered critical improvements 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: • Access drive, driveway, and parking areas • Drainage improvements • Permanent storm water quality treatment facilities • Revegetation
- o Record Drawings/CAD Files including drainage, PWQTF(s), and sidewalks shall be submitted prior to Final Engineering Site Inspection.
- o Prior to Certificate of Occupancy/Completion, an executed Ownership and Maintenance Agreement for the Permanent Stormwater Quality Treatment Facility shall be recorded.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o The 18 "tiny homes" have been reviewed and approved for use as either workforce housing OR multiple-family housing and therefore do not carry any agreement or deed restriction requirement by this approval. Should the applicant voluntarily decide to identify any of these 18 units as workforce housing, they may do so without additional review and under the following condition: 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.

