

June 24, 2022

City of Steamboat Springs Planning Department
137 10th Street
Steamboat Springs, CO 80477
Phone: (970)-871-8207

RE: Lot 1 Indian Meadows Phase 2 Development Plan at 307800001
Four Points Surveying and Engineering Job No. 1448-005

Dear Planning Staff;

The letter will serve as the formal reply to the Design Review Team comments from May 24, 2022, for the Phase 1 Development Plan for Lot 1 Indian Meadows F3. The following replies in red are the design team modifications and changes per the DRT comments.

Planning Review (Reviewed By: Toby Stauffer, AICP)

1. C3: remove proposed subdivision information as a subdivision has not been proposed
A Final Plat – Minor Subdivision Application was submitted for the proposed sub-division of Lot 1 Indian Meadows F3 into Lots 1 & 2 Indian Meadows F4. This should run concurrently with this application.
2. A2.2: Signage is not approved with this development plan, a separate sign permit will need to be applied for and reviewed for compliance with city standards. **Acknowledged.**
3. Sec. 223.B, Min Ground Story Height 14': It looks like the minimum ground story height on the building is less than 14'. Revise plans for compliance or request a variance. **Ground story height has been increased to 14'-0".**
4. Sec. 301.C.1: The proposed staff rooms look like a Dormitory use. Provide additional information about: 1) the staff break area and if it will provide a shared kitchen facility for the staff to use (as defined in the CDC), 2) if the rooms meet the Dormitory use standards, and 3) additional information about this conditional use in the narrative and criteria of approval for Conditional use. If the staff rooms are a Dormitory use, the project will include 2 conditional use requests that will need to be addressed in the narrative and revised throughout the plans. Provide occupancy information about each room as that will inform parking requirements. Indicate how occupancy will be enforced by the hotel operator and how the rooms will be secured for employees and not used for other purposes.
It just so happens that the Holiday Inn Parent Company will not allow the employee housing that we have proposed, So these will not be employee designated units but instead guest rooms.
5. 406.C, Parking, Hotel A: site plan lists 95 parking spaces provided, shows 94, please revise.
There are 95 spots (summer spots), perhaps you missed the single spot located next to the ADA spots.

6. CS: Amend to Dormitory **As noted above, staff rooms have been changed to guest rooms.**
7. CS: see comments site plan **All site plan comments have been addressed.**
8. CS: what is 90 based on? **Parking calculations clarified.**
9. CS: how many people proposed to occupy the staff rooms?
Staff rooms are no longer proposed.
10. Hotel B parking: 80 rooms require 80 spaces, 66 unencumbered spaces shown. Spaces shown as snow storage (2 spaces) or shown within the turnaround (7 spaces, southeast corner of property) cannot be counted toward the required amount as they are not clear for year-round parking. Demonstrate compliance with standards or request a variance.
Section 406: Provide Required bike parking for Hotel B. See additional comments about Hotel B site. **Hotel B and parking lot not part of this DP. Linework not associated w/ this DP was removed from the plans.**
11. Narrative, Development Plan Criteria #2: provide the approved Army Corps permit with the next submittal. **Army Corps Permit and associated docs provided in the Other attachments.**
12. Sec. 402.D: show required frontage landscaping and parking lot landscaping for Hotel B, if parking lot will be constructed after approval of this development plan. See comments on Narrative, interior landscaping is required if vertical construction of Hotel B will be part of this development plan. **Hotel B not part of this DP. Subdivision Final Plat of Lot 1 Submitted concurrently with this DP. An approved subdivision would not require full frontage landscaping in front of the entire Lot 1 as it is now.**
13. Section 402.D: interior parking lot landscaping, Hotel A , 7 shrubs additional shrubs required. **THE CORRECT NUMBER OF SHRUBS IS PRESENT ON THE CURRENT PLAN AS REQUIRED BY THE CITY OF STEAMBOAT SPRINGS CDC.**
14. Sec. 408.D.3, Refuse: provide elevations and materials information to comply with standards of this section. **A refuse detail was added to the exterior elevation sheet.**
15. C2: if this is an off site sign for a hotel, it will need to be removed, if this is a proposed sign it is not approved with this application. Please provide additional information with next submittal **It is an existing sign for the Fairfield Inn. It shall be removed as part of this development plan.**
16. C2: if this is a commercial sign, see other comment this page, if this is not a commercial sign please identify what type of sign it is
It is a commercial Sign for the Old Fairfield Inn, it will be removed.
17. L1: these are not yet approved plantings, please revise all labels. **PLANTINGS ARE LABELED AS PROPOSED - CREDIT FOR EXISTING PLANTINGS WAS USED IN THE INTERIOR LANDSCAPE CALCULATIONS**

AS THESE WILL BE INSTALLED.

18. L2: Frontage landscape area for this property should include the entire property frontage for a 30' depth with a 1/200 planting ratio provided. please revise, additional landscaping required. **Need to discuss this. THIS HAS BEEN REVISED AS WE DISCUSSED. LANDSCAPE PLANTINGS HAVE BEEN REVISED TO REFLECT THE NEW AREA CALCULATION AND CREDIT FOR EXISTING TREES WAS USED.**

19. L2: incorrect, 1/200 **#19 AND #20 REFER TO THE REQUIRED INTERIOR PLANTINGS. THE 500 PLANTINGS PER INTERIOR SF UTILIZED IS CORRECT FOR THE ZONE DISTRICT ACCORDING TO: Table 402-2. Parking Lot Setback and Interior Landscaping (continued) Zone District Parking Lot Setbacks Category 1 Interior Landscaping Category 1 CC EC EC Overlay 3. NOTE 3: For interior landscaping, the EC landscape category shall be 1 planting per 500 square feet**

20. L2: incorrect, EC required **#19 AND #20 REFER TO THE REQUIRED INTERIOR PLANTINGS. THE 500 PLANTINGS PER INTERIOR SF UTILIZED IS CORRECT FOR THE ZONE DISTRICT ACCORDING TO: Table 402-2. Parking Lot Setback and Interior Landscaping (continued) Zone District Parking Lot Setbacks Category 1 Interior Landscaping Category 1 CC EC Overlay 3**

NOTE 3: For interior landscaping, the EC landscape category shall be 1 planting per 500 square feet.

21. L2: inconsistent with what is shown on plan. **Civil, landscaping, and architectural plans were made consistent.**

22. L1, L2: more plantings are shown on L1 than are listed here, please revise for consistency. **L1 and L2 revised for consistency.**

23. Narrative: "Construction" of Hotel B will require architectural plans and other design and development standards to be addressed by this development plan. If the building will not be built after approval of this development plan, but parking or other site development will be built, clarify that in the narrative, plans, and request. Or, provide all required information that meets design and development standards for hotel B vertical and site development with this development plan. **Hotel B not part of this DP. Plans and narrative revised.**

24. Sec.409, Snow Storage, Hotel A: Square footage of areas shown does not match the amount of Total snow storage provided in chart, please provide consistent numbers. Snow Storage for Hotel A removes 15 parking spaces for year round use. Revise and update parking numbers in narrative and on plan set accordingly so a total parking space count can be noted on the final plans. **Total snow storage amount corrected.**

Sec. 409, Hotel B: Show required and proposed snow storage for Hotel B parking and site improvements. **Hotel B not part of this DP.**

25. CDC Section 417, Internal Sidewalks: Internal sidewalk between buildings does not meet

Engineering Standards. Revise design or request an engineering variance.

The trail will be concrete.

26. CDC Section 421, Open Space: Provide exhibit showing open space preserved in association with this development plan. Areas shown on this development plan should match numbers on cover sheet and should be distinct from open space areas provided for development plan for the road.

Open Space hatching provided and open space calculation updated on the cover sheet. Open space areas are not associated with the areas identified for phase 1.

27. CDC Section 427, Postal Facilities: Provide confirmation from the post office that indicates how postal services will be provided for this use.

The Owner confirmed that mail is delivered to the hotel lobby at his Homewood Suites Hotel and this is going to be the same for the Holiday Inn Express. An email was sent to the current standing postmaster but, per usual, there was no response after several weeks and several follow-up phone calls.

28. CDC Section 438.D.1, Access to public streets: The West side of the building should include an access to meet this standard. Revise the design or request a variance. An access door was added to the west façade.

29. CDC Section 438.E.1.b, Building step back: The design does not provide required step backs. Revise the design or request a variance. Building step back is not required as the maximum height to the eaves is less than 45' from finish grade as noted in the CDC.

30. CDC Section 438.K. Accessory Structures: Provide elevations and material information about trash enclosures/ three accessory structures. Trash enclosure details added to exterior elevations.

Mechanical Screening/Equipment: indicate location of any exterior mechanical equipment, on roof or on property and indicate how screening of those elements will meet standards of this section. If no exterior mechanical equipment, indicate that in the next submittal. Exterior equipment will be screened with metal fencing as shown in the renderings.

31. C1: See comments other pages, confirm correct # of spaces Updated spaces based on removing employee units and no credit applied for the employee units

32. C1: Sec. 406.D: Mixed use credit cannot be applied, no mix of uses, employee rooms serve hotel use, revise numbers in this chart, see comments in other sections
Mixed use and credit for parking removed.

33. C1: Confirm # of spaces for this use is correct, see comments other sections
OK, revised and confirmed based on comments in other sections.

34. C3: Existing off premises sign structure should be removed with development of this property The sign will be removed.

35. Parking spaces within the stone lane turn around: These spaces cannot be used, built, shown, or approved on the development plan until Stone Lane is constructed. Revise the design, parking counts, and plans accordingly. The future condition can be listed or shown on future plans for stone land and noted as not being approved with this DP.

Hotel B and parking lot not part of this DP.

36. Hotel B/Phase 3: This development plan is incomplete for most aspects of Hotel B/Phase 3. show and include all required elements for a DP for hotel B/Phase 3, or remove all hotel B/Phase 3 elements from this development plan. Include only the vertical development and site improvements that will be constructed within three years of approval of this DP. For all areas that will remain undeveloped, include information as to how those areas will be managed until there is an approved DP for them. *Hotel B and parking lot not part of this DP.*

37. If Hotel B will not be constructed with this DP, consider all necessary variances for site and vertical development. Standards that need to be considered include but are not limited to: Table 300-1, 402, 403, 404, 406.C, 409, 412, 413, 438.C, 438.G

CDC States per section 438.G: Development shall be placed to define the edges of and orient access to primary public and private streets, pedestrian circulation, and gathering areas.

We believe that the proposed development more than adequately defines the edges. We respectfully disagree with perception of where the hotel should be placed. The proposed location meets the intent of this code section and is much more suitable from a constructability perspective.

However, A final plat minor subdivision was submitted to be reviewed concurrently with this development plan. The subdivision will create two lots, Lot 1 and Lot 2 Indian Meadows F4. The Holiday Inn Express shall be located on the proposed Lot 1.

38. Section 438.H.1.b, Building Variation: the design of the building looks similar to the recently approved Homewood Suites project. Please revise the design and ensure that it can meet the standards of this section or request a variance. *Exterior design has been modified. Extent of changes include the following: Removal of the EIFS horizontal bands, changing stone manufacturer and color, changing overall color pattern, and reducing upper floor window sizes while still meeting the fenestration requirements. The design is not a standard trademark design and is simply a result of following the guidelines in the development code and meeting the requirements of a hotel (window sizes, spacing, etc). While we did have several colors from the previous Homewood Suites project, we have toned those colors down or changed them entirely.*

39. Improve the clarity throughout the submittal and plan set and include only aspects of development that will be developed after approval this DP. Remove all other aspects of development that will be developed under a separate or future DP.

Understood, clarity improved.

Building Department Review (Reviewed By: Todd Carr)

1. I have reviewed a total of 6 staff rooms on the main level, did these rooms get included in a separate ADA count or analysis for employee offered rooms, or did they get included in the total count of all hotel rooms? Currently none of the employee rooms are ADA accessible, I'm not sure if these rooms would follow a possible R-2 through Chapter 11 if they are permanent rooms or employees, or are these short term used only the nights that employees are working, so viewed as R-1? Please review and provide back a response on how these are viewed for ADA code review. **It just so happens that the Holiday Inn Parent Company will not allow the employee housing that we have proposed, So these will not be employee designated units but instead guest rooms.**
2. Local Code Amendment requires all stairs in commercial buildings to be 4 feet wide minimum from wall to wall, only handrails can encroach in the 4 foot minimum, not sure your intended width so wanted to make this comment. **All stairs are drawn at 4'-0" wide.**

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

1. Remove all improvements associated with Ph.3 as not a part of application.
Improvements associate with Ph. 3 removed from plans and the drainage exhibit, however just keep in mind that I have to account for the future drainage from the Phase 3 area in the overall drainage analysis.
2. Drainage Study: Insert information.
Information inserted based on final split flow study by Wohnrade.
3. Drainage Study: HDPE **Corrected spelling.**
4. Drainage Study: This needs to be included on the grading and drainage plans as an interim mitigation measure. **Included in the G&D plan as an interim measure. This site for the hotel will require a robust SWMP being it's over an acre in size and located next to wetlands.**
5. Drainage Study: % **Corrected**
6. Drainage Study: Turbulence factor shall be 1. **Turbulence factor corrected.**
7. Drainage Study: Turbulence factor shall be 1. **Turbulence factor corrected.**
8. Drainage Study: Turbulence factor shall be 1. **Turbulence factor corrected.**
9. Drainage Study: show where underdrains will be utilized. **Underdrains will not be utilized. They are not required and the native soil will infiltrate well as it is a Hydraulic Soil Group B per USDA Web Soil Survey. The backfill (not the 18" of media) will be specified for the rain gardens.**
10. Drainage Study: Will underdrains be utilized? Also show inlets in detail. **Underdrains will not be utilized. The loamy native soil is of a hydraulic soil group B and will work well for infiltration.**
11. C4.2: Remove Ph.3 from this application. **Removed**
12. C4.2: City may require bus pullout to be constructed with this project. Engineering will coordinate with Transit and provide direction prior to second submittal.
N/A. Emrick will spoke with Jonathan Flint, transit manager.

13. C4.3: Inlets within rain gardens shall be set so the top of grate elevation is = to the WQCV elevation. Understood, the WQCV depth is established in the UD_BMP Design Spreadsheets and the final rim elevation will be established with the construction drawings and final construction grades. The rims can be adjusted as necessary to meet WQCV requirements.

14. Wohnrade Hydraulic Analysis: Recommendations outlined in this report shall be implemented with Phase 2. We request that the proposed improvements from Wohnrade not be tied to this development plan as it will not affect flooding conditions associated with this hotel. Confirmed, n/a for this DP. Emrick confirmed these improvements do not need to be tied to this DP.

15. TIS: Not included Table 5 added to the TIS

16. TIS: Update to correct number of rooms. Number of rooms updated. 87 for the Holiday Inn and ~80 are expected for the Hampton Inn. Employee rooms removed from the study.

17. C3: Alternative Compliance via fee in lieu will be required for this section sidewalk. Cost estimate will be for concrete only. Fee in lieu calc provided on sheet 3.2 for the stone lane bridge addition and in the narrative. \$15.56/SF of concrete sidewalk is the estimated unit cost.

Utilities-Mount Werner Review (Reviewed By: Richard Buccino)

1. Revise sewer main alignment to be minimum 10-feet outside the limits of the parking island curb lines. Tree root growth into sewer mains is problematic with shallow cover sewer mains. Alignment and easement Revised Accordingly.

2. 'Connecting to existing manhole with core boar' is in conflict with existing manhole steps and therefore unacceptable. An acceptable realignment would be to locate proposed sewer in East/West access road. This would necessitate a new cut-in manhole along the existing sewer main. This new manhole shall be precast and with a main flowline drop consistent with the existing grade of the existing N/S sewer main. Proposed invert-in shall be 2 tenths higher than invert out. Sewer main alignment revised w/ new manhole tie-in.

3. Label the new tie-in manhole MH 25.5.2A.7.1 and the proposed manhole up at the proposed hotels MH25.5.2A.7.2 Labels added.

4. Revise Water Main layout as follows:

- a. Label tie to existing System as a 'Live-Tie'. Addressed
- b. Move service line and fire suppression valves from near the buildings to be on the branch cross and tee. Addressed
- c. Show location of all Locate Stations. Show one at Live Tie assembly and one on the back side of the Fire Hydrant. Add note to carry locate wire into building along water lines and come up in mech rooms Addressed
- d. Add an additional 6" valve on the Fire Hydrant lateral up on the branch tee by the 8x6 reducer. Addressed

e. Revise call outs to be clear which line is domestic and which line is Fire Suppression.

Addressed

f. Show limits of Mechanical room walls on Utility plan. Addressed

g. It is assumed the water and sewer stubs to Hotel B will be installed with Phase I Hotel A construction. Please confirm Phase I scope. That would make the most sense.

h. Label all water line branches as 'Private'.

All items for comment #4 addressed. Please reference the water main connections detail view at 1:10 scale below the 1:20 plan.

5. Existing Manhole Rings and Covers along East side of property cannot be lowered in elevation due to shallow sewer main depths. Road must be in fill over the top of the existing sewer mains and rings and covers. Add final manhole ring and cover elevations to Grading and Drainage Plan and to Utility Plan with notes to each manhole to specify what grade adjustment is necessary and the methods used to adjust grades; i.e. 'add 4" CI riser ring'.

The construction drawings will include this detail for the rim adjustment at final grade. The road grade at existing manhole 25.5.2a.7 was designed so that there would be minimal rim adjustment required.

6. Engineered/ready rock retaining walls not permitted in MWW Water or Sewer Easements

We are not proposing any retaining walls for this development.

1. ATMOS ENERGY CORPORATION

2# Systems will not be allowed unless proof of an appliance requiring a MINIMUM of over 7"

W.C. is provided to Atmos Energy Corporation personnel for review. Acknowledged. System will be designed around a 7" W.C. gas supply pressure.

Information Comments:

- Meter location must be approved by an Atmos Energy Corporation employee during a mandatory site visit to be scheduled after foundation is in place.
- Meters will not be allowed under a shedding roofline or where overhanging snow is a danger to the meter set.
- Any work performed in utility easements must be approved by Atmos Energy Corp