



October 20, 2021

Stephen Carrolla  
1390 Lawrence Street, Denver, CO 80204  
Denver, CO 80238

**Re: SSRC Gold Walk Wall - Brand Wall at 211077001**

**Dear Stephen Carrolla,**

This letter shall serve as the Development Review Team letter (DRT) for Submittal #1 of the above referenced project.

Your proposal has generated comments that need resolution prior to scheduling for hearing(s) or a decision being made.

Please address each comments 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each comment or formally request an extension within 30 days of the date of this letter or the application may be withdrawn.

The resubmittal should include:

- The most recent revision date
- A response to each individual comment
- PDFs of all materials

Please submit materials digitally through the Portal on our website. Complete submittals shall be distributed within two business days of receipt.

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) 871-8231 or by email at [mfitz@steamboatsprings.net](mailto:mfitz@steamboatsprings.net) with any questions or concerns.

**Planning Review** (Reviewed By: Michael Fitz)



1. Staff cannot support the request as-written, but may be able to with some revisions and additional justification. The correct criteria for a sign Major Adjustment is new and has not yet been incorporated into the CDC, so I have provided the CDC text amendment as a portal document which can be downloaded and used - there are actually fewer justifications required, so you will be able to use many of your existing points.

Some things to think about in your justification - what does the sign look from adjacent properties (particularly the Sheraton) and talk about its location and whether it faces the public or is merely intended for people already onsite. Also perhaps explain what is unique about this site (functionally, not simply the geographic presence of mountains) that justifies this property being treated differently than other properties. Does this sign cause the property to gain business at the expense of others and/or cause other businesses to lose customers? If not, explain a bit more why.

2. Your lighting plan does a great job of showing where this sign is proposed, but your site plan is unclear. Please revise your site plan to very clearly indicate where the sign is going.

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

We have no comments as we have reviewed this addendum through permitting process and have no issues with this application

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Michael Fitz".

Michael Fitz  
Planning Technician