



April 05, 2022

Four Points Surveying and Engineering - Joe W
PO BOX 775966
Steamboat Springs, CO 80487

Re: Lot 1 Indian Meadows Phase 1 Development Plan at 307800001

Dear Four Points Surveying and Engineering - Joe W,

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each comment or formally request an extension within 30 days of the date of this letter or the application may be withdrawn.

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 contact me at (970) 871-8280 or by email at tstauffer@steamboatsprings.net with questions or concerns.

Planning Review (Reviewed By: Toby Stauffer, AICP)

1. Easement vacation and easement dedications shall occur at the same time as phase one but shall be subject to approval of this DP and approval of the easement vacation. Include a reference to easement dedication and vacation timing in the narrative.



2. The 8' trail will require a public access easement. Provide the easement at the same time as all other easement dedications. Provide information about year round maintenance for trail connection and provide locations for snow storage if trail will be cleared.

3. Informational comments: CDC Section 406.C.1.c: Number of parking spaces has not been evaluated but it looks like parking may exceed the maximum and may require a variance.

4. CDC Section 421: The development is required to provide open space.

Document Markups

5. Narrative: remove for this dp

6. Narrative: A CONCEPT PLAN was reviewed by city staff, that is different from a Conceptual Development Plan. There is no approved conceptual development plan for this property, this criteria is not applicable. Please remove or revise these statements.

7. Narrative: Conditional use doesn't apply to this DP

8. Site Plan: Parking should not encroach into turn-around. Future development will need to consider an interim condition that maintains a turn-around, without parking, until Stone Lane is built.

9. Side Plan: See Planning informational comments

10. Landscape Plan: Provide correct zoning

11. Landscape Plan: Number of spaces on landscape plan are different from landscape plan. Please revise and ensure all plans are consistent

12. This development plan is not a phased development plan, remove all references to future submittals or projects. Amend the scope of the current application to describe only the development that is being requested with this application. If any aspects of the development with this application will be phased, make corrections, if not, remove all references to phasing. If approved, this development would include only the four items listed in paragraph three of the narrative, revise criteria for approval accordingly. Revise plans to only show the work for this development plan, not the rest of the conceptual development of this property.

13. It appears the proposed plan may conflict with improvements planned on the adjacent property and approved DP, PL20210053, Storm Peak Apartments. Both projects should be coordinated and the adjacent property should provide a substantial conformance application to request approval of proposed changes if this development is approved.

14. A development agreement will be required to coordinate access development timing, easement dedication and vacation timing, trail development, revegetation of old access, coordination of road development with hotel development, and coordination with changes to the Storm Peak Apartments project and development plan.

15. To manage and mitigate environmental impacts from this project provide additional plantings, water quality, and wetland restoration along the eastern property boundary. The City will work with you to provide a temporary easement for wetland restoration work on the City's property to allow for a more effective, higher quality restoration project.

16. Cross Access Plan: Add additional labeling that indicates this is a potential/draft/not approved/not constructed with this project cross access alignment. Consider graying out some information that is not part of this DP request

17. Review draft conditions of approval in the conditions panel and review informational comments in documents and images panel.

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

1. C2: Missing 30ft utility easement.
2. Easement
3. Remove. Not a part of this development plan.
4. C3: Sidewalk tie-in shall be to the nearest joint.
5. C3: Not showing the existing valley pan along the north side of Stone Lane on all sheets.
6. C3: Provide a cost estimate and provide fee in lieu for length of sidewalk to be built with Stone Lane bridge.
7. C3: Crosswalk cross slope of 2.00% max is required.
8. C3: Explain the purpose of this additional paved area and need for a median? It appears that both can be removed to reduce maintenance needs and potential issues with snow removal. May be an ideal location for a water quality facility.
9. C3: Is this parking required? If not, it may be better suited to remove and provide water quality facility to treat this area.
10. C3: ACOE permit will be required prior to BP.
11. C3: Provide cross sections of access road including critical locations showing property line, grading limits wetland disturbance limits etc.
12. C3: Show FES and riprap at outfall and confirm linework. Appears there are two pipes?
13. C3: How will vehicles be restricted from encroaching onto the sidewalk?
14. C3: What is this extra line work?
15. C3: This trail shall be concrete.
16. C3: Show future phases as a lighter line weight and hatch so it is clear what is proposed with the first phase on all sheets.
17. C3: This proposed access shall be constructed and feathered into the existing pavement. This will allow for the remaining area of turnaround to be removed without impacting access.
18. C3: Determine if vehicle overhang encroaches into travel lane? 4ft offset may not be sufficient for clearance.
19. C4: Plan and Profile do not seem to match at interface of existing/proposed at Sta. 0+57?
20. C4: Explain the need for a sag vertical curve?
21. C4: Confirm this will be provide with this City Project

22. C4: Provide details on how drainage will be conveyed through this area when Stone Lane Bridge is constructed?
23. C4: All drainage easements need to provide access from the public Right of Way.
24. C4: Crosswalk cross slope of 2.00% max is required.
25. C4: FES and riprap shall terminate prior to property line.
26. C7: Include removal of existing access road in Ph. 1
27. C7: This pavement area shall be included with Ph.1 and taped into existing.
28. C7: Water quality for west side of access road will be required with Ph.1
29. L1: Water quality swale is shown differently on other sheets. Which one is correct?
30. C4: Provide two site plans and profiles for the cul-de-sac. One during the time Stone Lane cul-de-sac is in plane. One when Stone Lane has been extended to the east.
31. Drainage Study: Does not appear grass swales provide sufficient treatment. May consider making the entire length of grass swale a treatment facility.
32. Drainage Study: n=1 shall be used for grass swales.
33. Drainage Study: 18.62
34. Drainage Study: n=1 shall be used for grass swales.
35. Drainage Study: 49
36. Drainage Study: n=1 shall be used for grass swales.
37. Drainage Study: 45
38. Drainage Study: n=1 shall be used for grass swales.
39. Drainage Study: 43.26
40. Drainage Study: side slopes need to be 4:1
41. Drainage Study: side slopes need to be 4:1
42. Drainage Study: side slopes need to be 4:1
43. Drainage Study: side slopes need to be 4:1
44. Drainage: Next page shows 0.5%. which one is it?
45. Drainage Study: 19% of the site is not being treated. Fill out second portion of sheet.
46. Drainage Study: there are four grass swales total.
47. C8: grass swales will need to be deep enough to handle the proposed snow storage to eliminate the chance of spilling over into wetlands. some sort of snow fence may be necessary.
48. C8: Where is the future phases store snow? it appears there is limited space for future snow storage area.
49. Drainage Study: Each sub-basin is not fully treated by the entire length of the grass buffer. further detail will need to be provided to show that drainage will be conveyed through the entire length of the grass buffers.
50. Drainage Study: evaluate the outflow controlled condition for the 100 yr event.
51. Prelim. Floodplain Analysis: The over-topping of Stone Lane needs further study and discussion. What is the overflow path?



External Agency Review

1. Atmos Energy

There is a 4" gas main near phase 1 road easement. The line runs behind the Fairfield/Holiday Inn hotels and end behind the Homewood suites. Will the new access road effect the gas line easement? I do not see it on any of the drawings.

2. Parks and Recreation- Craig Robinson

Provide additional information about who will maintain the proposed soft surface trail. Clarify and confirm that car bumpers will not encroach into the soft surface trail. More separation or a fence may be needed.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Toby Stauffer".

Toby Stauffer, AICP
Senior Planner