



June 09, 2022

Matthew McLeod
PO Box 775966
Steamboat Springs, CO 80477

Re: Steamboat Airpark Preliminary Plat at 280600001

Dear Matthew McLeod,

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each comment or formally request an extension within 30 days of the date of this letter or the application may be withdrawn.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) 871-8260 or by email at bkeenan@steamboatsprings.net with any questions or concerns.

Planning Review (Reviewed By: Bob Keenan, AICP)

1. Please provide required Mineral Rights Affidavit.
2. Your narrative incorrectly states that the current property is zoned MF-3. The rezoning was contingent on approval of the Final Plat associated with PP-18-03. Please update your narrative.

Given the above, you may need to submit a zoning map amendment concurrently with this application. We have reviewed your plat to MF-3 zoning for proposed lot 1. The remainder parcel should be rezoned when platted but not before.

3. Subdivision Standards:

602.C - A street shall not divide a lot. Please revise the plat proposal to create additional lots where the proposed access easement divides the proposed lots.

602.D - Demonstrate compliance with Useable Lot Area requirements. Areas that do not qualify shall be placed in open space or labeled as unbuildable. Provide analysis on existing conditions plan.

602.F -

a. Subdivisions shall be designed to comply with multi-mode facilities and complete streets. This includes the "access road". Which should have sidewalks, street trees, bike lanes, etc.

i. Any street that provides access to more than 2 lots or 4 units shall be a public street. A public street shall be proposed or a variance shall be requested.

j. Access easements shall not serve more than two lots and shall not exceed 100 feet in length.

l. Propose a street name

602.G Vegetation and Site Grading - Demonstrate compliance with tree preservation requirements, as applicable

602.K Postal facilities are required

602.D Critical Improvements - Staff has identified the following as critical improvements that must accepted or approved prior to any building permit approval: access drive, sidewalks, Gossard Extension, drainage infrastructure, and utilities

602. P - Phasing - Propose any necessary phasing or the entire project will be required to be completed in one phase.

4. 426, Access

4. In MF zone districts:

a. Multiple-family residential developments of ten acres or more shall include a minimum of one public street that is continuous through the site and connects to a public street on both ends. The Planning Director may waive this requirement for a through-access street if the applicant demonstrates that there are adequate alternatives available for residents and vehicles to travel through the development to adjacent properties and developments.

5. A plat note shall be added noting that that the larger parcel is not developable until replatted in accordance to the CDC. Staff can work with you on this language.

6. Miscellaneous Corrections

What is the purpose of sheet PP18? Should be removed from submittal?

PP2 - label all linework

What is the purpose of PP3, label line work.

The match sheet notes reference plan sets that are not included. Example C2.

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

1. PP2: Access on this lot will be required to be graded in for future connection. Will need a development agreement that this is dedicated as ROW and constructed prior to any future development.
2. PP2: This is required to be dedicated public Right of Way.
3. PP18: Show the full extents of the proposal on this sheet or have an additional sheet for site plan.
4. PP18: What cross section is this road built to?
5. PP12: K value does not meet the minimum requirement.
6. PP12: What typical section is being utilized?
7. PP12: Does not appear that intersection parameters are being met. Table 4.2
8. PP13: Profiles shall be provided in numerical order.
9. PP13: K value does not meet the minimum requirement.
10. PP13: Does not meet intersection parameters per Engineering Standards Table 4.2.
11. PP13: Road Profiles 2 & 3 need to be combined into one profile.
12. PP7: Provide road cross sections.
14. Drainage Study: Show full extents, basins, calcs, etc of parcels associated with this application
15. Drainage Study: Remove all receiving pervious area as it is intended to function via sheet flow not concentrated in addition should not be sloped greater than 3:1.
16. Drainage Study: Confirm velocities in all Water Quality swales. Shall exceed one foot per second.
17. Drainage Study: Detention appears to be required.
18. Drainage Study: Include approved scope.
20. Drainage Study: Provide detail as to what this detention basin is for/ associated calcs and historic vs post development flows.
21. Geotech Report: This report shall be updated to analyze current proposal and evaluate cut and fill slopes with recommendations.
22. Prelim. Geologic Hazard Eval: This report shall be updated to analyze current proposal.
23. Further information/detail is required to provide further review of current proposal.

Sincerely,



Bob Keenan, AICP
Principal Planner