



ROUTT COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

AGENDA COMMUNICATION FORM

ITEM DATE: September 20, 2022	ITEM TIME: 9:35 am

FROM:	Alan Goldich
TODAY'S DATE:	September 13, 2022
AGENDA TITLE:	Landaulet Sketch Subdivision
CHECK ONE THAT APPLIES TO YOUR ITEM:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ACTION ITEM	
<input type="checkbox"/> DIRECTION	
<input type="checkbox"/> INFORMATION	
I. DESCRIBE THE REQUEST OR ISSUE:	
Consideration of the Sketch Subdivision review for Landaulet.	
II. RECOMMENDED ACTION (motion):	

I move to approve item PL20220050, a Sketch Subdivision for the Landaulet Subdivision on Lot 8 Snokomo Estates, and Lots 9, 9A and 9B of Snokomo Estates F2 with the following findings of fact:

1. The proposal with the following conditions meets the applicable guidelines of the Stagecoach Community Plan, particularly:
 - 1) 5.2.2.B, C, and E
 - 2) 5.3.1.1.A
 - 3) 5.4.1.B and E
 - 4) 5.5.1.A, D, H, and J
 - 5) 5.6.1.A and B
2. The proposal with the following conditions meets the applicable guidelines of the Routt County Master Plan, particularly:
 - 1) 3.3.C
 - 2) 4.3.D
 - 3) 6.3.H
 - 4) 9.3.F
 - 5) 11.3.F, G, J, O, and W

This approval is subject to the following conditions:

General Conditions:

1. This Sketch Subdivision Plan approval is contingent on submittal of a complete application for a Preliminary Subdivision Plan within twelve (12) months. Extension of up to one (1) year may be approved administratively.
2. All federal, state and local permits shall be obtained, including but not limited to: Grading And Excavating, Work in the Right of Way, and Access permits



ROUTT COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

AGENDA COMMUNICATION FORM

3. Prior to recordation, the applicant shall submit an electronic copy of the approved plat to the County Planning Department in a format acceptable to the GIS Department.
4. All property taxes must be paid prior to the recording of the final plat.
5. If applicable, the right of way for County Road 16 shall be appropriately dedicated on the final plat.
6. The Preliminary Plan submittal shall include the following detailed information:
 - a. Utility plans produced by a registered Colorado Engineer per the 2016 Routt County Road & Bridge Roadway Standards (roads, water, sewer, fire hydrants, grading and drainage, utilities, etc.)
 - b. Soils report
 - c. Landscaping plan including significant efforts to mitigate views from surrounding properties
 - d. All lot dimensions
 - e. Plan showing land to be dedicated as open space in conformance with Section 3.5.1 of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - f. Site plan showing land to be dedicated for public sites or calculation of payment in lieu in conformance with Section 3.5.2, 3.5.3, and 5.3.4 of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - g. Engineered drainage study of the site per 2016 Routt County Road & Bridge Roadway Standards.
 - h. A traffic study performed by a registered Colorado Engineer based upon the number of approved units at full build out and shall include the following:
 - traffic impacts on CR 16; and
 - trip distribution at the intersection of CR 16 and CR 212; and
 - trip distribution at the intersection CR 14 and CR 16; and
 - recommendations for signage, improvements, and other mitigation measures; and
 - summary of what the development would do to the level of service of CR 14 in both directions

Comments shall be obtained from Routt County Public Works, prior to submittal of the Preliminary Subdivision application.

 - i. Road construction plans and specifications for the interior access road which meet the minimum requirements of the Oak Creek Fire Protection District, Routt County Public Works Director, and the Routt County Board of County Commissioners. Plans and specifications shall carefully consider minimizing cuts, fills and visual scarring.
 - j. Engineer drawings for connection to the central water and sewer system.
 - k. Draft Covenants
 - l. Wildlife Mitigation Plan approved by Colorado Parks and Wildlife.
 - m. Snow Storage plan based upon the City of Steamboat Springs' standards
 - n. Slope analysis of site with slopes greater than 30% identified
7. The Final Plat notes shall include, but are not limited to:
 - a. Routt County is not responsible for maintaining or improving subdivision roads. The roads shown hereon have not been dedicated nor accepted by the County.



ROUTT COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

AGENDA COMMUNICATION FORM

- b. Existing and new accesses shall meet access standards set forth by the Routt County Public Works Department and Fire Prevention Services.
 - c. Routt County (County) and the Oak Creek Fire Protection District (District) shall be held harmless from any injury, damage, or claim that may be made against the County or the District by reason of the County's or the District's failure to provide ambulance, fire, rescue or police protection to the property described on this plat, provided that the failure to provide such services is due to inaccessibility of the property by reason of internal roads being impassable. This conditions shall not relieve the County or the District of their responsibility to make a bona fide effort to provide emergency services should the need arise.
 - d. All exterior lighting shall be downcast and opaquely shielded.
 - e. Address signage shall be in conformance with Routt County Road Addressing, Naming, and Signing Policy shall be located at the entrance to the driveway.
 - f. A current soils test showing that the soils are sufficiently stable to support development will be required before obtaining a building permit.
 - g. Revegetation of disturbed areas shall occur within one growing season with a seed mix that avoids the use of aggressive grassed. See the Colorado State University Extension Office for appropriate grass mixes.
 - h. All trails are open to the public.
8. A 'no build' zone shall be indicated on the plat to avoid construction of structures and roads in areas including, but not limited to 30% or greater slopes. The "no build" zones shall be defined on the plat and approved by the Planning Director before the plat is recorded.
9. The open space parcels shall be deeded to the property owners' association and such deed shall be recorded concurrently with the Final Plat. The plat shall indicate that the Open Space parcel is open to the public.
10. The Final Plat shall show a 10' public utility easements along the interior of all lot lines and such shall be dedicated appropriately.
11. Covenants shall include:
- a. Requirement to control noxious weeds
 - b. Roads will be privately maintained
 - c. No on street parking
 - d. All restrictions referenced in CPW's letter dated March 31, 2021
 - e. A restriction on short term rentals



ROUTT COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

AGENDA COMMUNICATION FORM

III. DESCRIBE FISCAL IMPACTS (VARIATION TO BUDGET):
PROPOSED REVENUE <i>(if applicable)</i> : \$
CURRENT BUDGETED AMOUNT : \$
PROPOSED EXPENDITURE : \$
FUNDING SOURCE :
SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET NEEDED : YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Explanation :
IV. IMPACTS OF A REGIONAL NATURE OR ON OTHER JURISDICTIONS (IDENTIFY ANY COMMUNICATIONS ON THIS ITEM):
V. BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

Planning Commission heard this application at their 9/1/22 hearing. They recommended approval with an 8-0 vote.

There were nine letters submitted after the staff packet had been distributed. They are attached to this form for your review. In addition to this, two people who did not submit letters spoke at the hearing. All of them were in opposition to the application. It should be noted that all letters and comments came from residents of the neighboring Red Hawk development. Concerns mentioned in the letters include negative visual impacts (particularly of the four-plexes), general non-compliance with the Stagecoach Community Area Plan (SCAP), density, traffic, and affordability. A lot of these same concerns were expressed during the public comment portion of the hearing.

Planning Commission asked for additional information on some of the other high density developments in the area to use as a comparison to the proposed density. Below is a breakdown of those densities. The current application is for 41 units on 9.11 acres (4.5 units per acre). Of the three neighboring high density developments, the current application is comparable to those existing developments.

- Red Hawk – 29 single family residences on 9.48 acres (3 units per acre)
- Wagonwheel – 4 eight-plexes, 1 nine-plex (41 total units) on 5.18 acres (7.9 units per acre)
- Eagles Nest – 3 six-plexes, 2 seven-plexes (32 total units) on 6.43 acres (4.9 units per acre)

Planning Commission had concerns with the layout of the project, specifically related to available snow storage areas and structure setbacks to roads and trails. Staff suggested that Planning Commission evaluate the application on the proposed density and if this were reduced for the next application due to site constraints, then the Sketch approval (if approved) would not be jeopardized. Staff would apply building setbacks to the property lines of the entire property. Setbacks between individual buildings would be dictated by the Building Code. Members of the public provided comments stating that they were opposed the proximity of some of the structures to the property lines and neighboring developments. Planning Commission also made suggestions about how to possibly reduce visual impacts by swapping the locations of the garage and the units so that the large dwelling unit structures would be on the inside of the development as opposed to the exterior. They also recommended requiring a landscape plan that *“includes significant efforts to mitigate views from surrounding properties.”*



ROUTT COUNTY BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

AGENDA COMMUNICATION FORM

Potential traffic impacts were discussed. A traffic study is not required at this stage of review but is recommended for the next stage of review. Planning Commission wanted to ensure that impacts to both CR 16 and CR 14 are evaluated. Staff spoke with Road and Bridge about the language of the condition requiring a traffic study. Road and Bridge's suggested language is included as condition 6h.

VI. LEGAL ISSUES:
N/A
VII. CONFLICTS OR ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:
N/A
VIII. SUMMARY AND OTHER OPTIONS:
<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Deny2. Table for additional information
IX. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS:
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Public comments not included in the staff report• DRAFT Planning Commission minutes from 9/1/22• Staff report

From: [Dave Bingham](#)
To: [Alan Goldich](#)
Subject: RHV Planning Commission mtg
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2022 7:27:09 PM

Alan,

We have attached an email from Nate and Molly Wojcik below. We don't think we can communicate our concerns better than Nate and Molly already have in their email. Please take this as our support for concerns they have raised.

Kind Regards,

Dave and Robyn Bingham

23640 Sagebrush Circle
Oak Creek, CO 80467

Hello Alan,

As owners of property adjacent to the newly proposed Landaulet subdivision (Planning Project #PL20220050), we are writing to publicly object to the development plans as they have been proposed. We live at 23710 Sagebrush Cir, in the Red Hawk Village subdivision, which is located directly south of one of the fourplex units that has been proposed. We are not able to attend the live planning commission meeting that is scheduled for tomorrow (Sept. 1) but would still like the opportunity to voice our concerns around this project.

Our primary concerns are as follows:

1. Disregard for Stagecoach Community Plan. As was expressed at previous hearings for the Snokomo Estates and Landaulet subdivisions, we're very disappointed in the complete disregard by the Routt County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners in upholding the Stagecoach community's wishes for our beloved community. A detailed description of the specific sections of the community plan that we find this development to be in violation of can be found in the attached letter that was previously submitted by the SPOA Board of Directors to the Routt County Planning Commission on May 27, 2021. What's the point in having a community plan at all if it's just going to be blatantly ignored? Decisions like these by our elected officials foster an environment of mistrust in our officials and civic processes and set a dangerous precedent for future decisions surrounding any community planning initiatives.

2. Density, building heights, and setbacks. The density of residences on the proposed plans (referenced in attachment) is far higher than was originally proposed, and is very concerning. Furthermore, the plans do not include the height of the fourplex units, which is critical to understand the impact to our viewsapes. Currently our home has an unimpeded view to the lake, which adds a significant amount of value to our home and our neighbors' homes. Removing these views will directly impact our property values. An additional concern is adherence to proper setbacks from our property lines. As we understand it, the visible flagging

that has been installed on the proposed development site indicates where the roads will be, and it's difficult to envision how a fourplex unit will fit between there and our property line with the required setback allowances. We'd like to understand any options available to work with the builder to minimize all of these impacts.

4. Traffic impact. To our knowledge, there have been no traffic impact assessments performed for the addition of 41 residences. If we figure 2 cars per household, we're looking at an additional 82 vehicles on our roads. Our big concern is the curvy s-turn on CR 16 between the proposed entrance to the new subdivision and our Red Hawk Village neighborhood. This road has very narrow shoulders with no sidewalks. It is already dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists who travel this road, and adding so many more vehicles to the road without also adding pedestrian options will only further this endangerment.

5. Affordability. As residents of Routt County, we are all too aware of the housing crisis that our community faces. We want to support measures that help provide more options for our fellow community members, especially teachers, police, firefighters, nurses, and all those who are so vital to our community. We recognize that the county is desperate to latch on to any solutions that might help curb this crisis, and we are very supportive of some of the actions that are being taken, including evaluation of short term rental restrictions and development of income-restricted housing. However, we don't believe that this proposed subdivision is a solution to the affordable housing crisis. While we haven't seen proposed pricing on the units in question, we do know that newly constructed single family homes in our area are going for well over \$1M - far out of reach for the teachers and nurses we need in this community. I would urge the Board of Commissioners to take a long, hard look at whether this subdivision actually helps their cause, or simply brings more affluent and second home owners to the area.

We recognize that growth of the Stagecoach community is inevitable. We simply ask that the developers be considerate and respectful of the communities that they are impacting by acknowledging our concerns and working with local residents to try to minimize impacts where possible. We are more than willing to work together with the developer to collaborate on solutions that minimize these impacts.

Thank you,

Molly and Nate Wojcik

23710 Sagebrush Cir
Oak Creek, CO 80467

From: geoffblakeslee@gmail.com
To: [Alan Goldich](#)
Subject: Landaulet subdivision ; planning project PL20220050
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 6:10:59 PM

Aug 30,2022

RE: Landaulet Subdivision; Planning Project # PL20220050

Dear Mr. Goldich,

We are writing to express our disapproval of the proposed Landaulet subdivision. We ask that the planning commission not advance this proposal through the county process without a significant reduction of the subdivision's density.

We are residents of the neighboring Red Hawk community. We wrote a letter in opposition, in May, when the Routt County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) heard the request for a zone change for the parcel on which this subdivision is proposed. The BOCC was acting on the recommendation to approve by the Routt County Planning Commission. Our entire Red Hawk community is opposed to this development as proposed. The Stagecoach Homeowners Association (SPOA) wrote in opposition the the original zone change. Without regard to the concerns of the Stagecoach community, the Planning Commission and BOCC approved this zone change. The issues are substantial.

First of all, a Comprehensive Master Plan was developed for the Stagecoach community as recently as 2018. This proposed Landaulet Subdivision parcel was recommended for low density zoning. The plan was approved by SPOA, and the BOCC. Members of the Stagecoach Community spent two years working on the Master Plan. A great deal of thoughtful consideration was given to the future of the Stagecoach area development, while recognizing the beauty of the area and the local residents desire to preserve its open rural character as much as possible. The Landaulet Subdivision violates every aspect of the Stagecoach Master Plan. We respect a landowners rights. Our recognition of these rights are contrary to a comment made by the proposed Subdivision's engineer, Walter Magill, of Four Points Engineering when he stated during the BOCC meeting in May that we are simply "Nimby's" opposing this project just because. We are not NIMBY's! We are neighbors and members of this community who care about how this development will affect our lives. We are your constituents!

The latest proposal represents something very different from what was presented during the BOCC hearing in May of 2022. We are concerned about the proximity of potential two story buildings and parking spaces located directly across the existing fence from many of our neighbors. Cramming 41 units on a small parcel is not consistent with what the Stagecoach area has been envisioned or has been developed up to now. Please don't ruin this desirable living space with such a landscape altering development. We implore you to listen to our neighbors and community members in opposition to this development.

Sincerely,

Betsy and Geoff Blakeslee

Geoff Blakeslee | 23590 Sagebrush Circle, Oak Creek, CO 80467
970-846-1211
geoffblakeslee@gmail.com

From: [Alisa Bonelli](#)
To: [Alan Goldich](#)
Subject: Re Landaulet subdivision
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2022 1:13:40 PM

Hello Alan,

Molly and Nates letter below embodies what we all a feeling in this neighborhood. I copied and pasted it to this email to show that I am speaking up and asking that these issues are addressed. In addition, I would like for the members to please come out and look at the site. And I would like the follow questions to be answered

1. What is the elevation of the planned buildings?
- 2, How far are they from the property line that borders Redhawk Village?
3. Will you be stripping the current landscape to flatten the hills and have a flat building site? That would ruin the esthetic of Stagecoach!
- 4, Do you have a weed control plan in place if excavating?

To the planning commission members:

I urge you to think carefully about adding homes that just create growth and no end to the issues we are facing. The county needs to focus and catch up on workforce housing before you add more homes for the sake of adding more homes. We desperately need homes for the workforce not just homes. The housing authority has plans in place lets wait for them to catch up!!

I also urge you to consider environmental issues and ask all new developments to be green! No Grass No watering! Yes to solar etc.

I know everyone is crazy about housing, but lets slow down and make this a more thoughtful process!

Also - This is RIGHT NEXT TO my house! It is way too close

And everything Molly said!

Thank you!
Alisa Bonelli
23700 Sagebrush Circle
Oak Creek, CO 80467
970-846-4655

Hello Alan,

As owners of property adjacent to the newly proposed Landaulet subdivision (Planning Project #PL20220050), we are writing to publicly object to the development plans as they have been proposed. We live at 23710 Sagebrush Cir, in the Red Hawk Village subdivision, which is located directly south of one of the fourplex units that has been proposed. We are not able to attend the live planning commission meeting that is scheduled for tomorrow (Sept. 1) but would still like the opportunity to voice our concerns around this project.

Our primary concerns are as follows:

1. Disregard for Stagecoach Community Plan. As was expressed at previous hearings for the Snokomo Estates and Landaulet subdivisions, we're very disappointed in the complete disregard by the Routt County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners in upholding the Stagecoach community's wishes for our beloved community. A detailed description of the specific sections of the community plan that we find this development to be in violation of can be found in the attached letter that was previously submitted by the SPOA Board of Directors to the Routt County Planning Commission on May 27, 2021. What's the point in having a community plan at all if it's just going to be blatantly ignored? Decisions like these by our elected officials foster an environment of mistrust in our officials and civic processes and set a dangerous precedent for future decisions surrounding any community planning initiatives.

2. Density, building heights, and setbacks. The density of residences on the proposed plans (referenced in attachment) is far higher than was originally proposed, and is very concerning. Furthermore, the plans do not include the height of the fourplex units, which is critical to understand the impact to our viewsapes. Currently our home has an unimpeded view to the lake, which adds a significant amount of value to our home and our neighbors' homes. Removing these views will directly impact our property values. An additional concern is adherence to proper setbacks from our property lines. As we understand it, the visible flagging that has been installed on the proposed development site indicates where the roads will be, and it's difficult to envision how a fourplex unit will fit between there and our property line with the required setback allowances. We'd like to understand any options available to work with the builder to minimize all of these impacts.

4. Traffic impact. To our knowledge, there have been no traffic impact assessments performed for the addition of 41 residences. If we figure 2 cars per household, we're looking at an additional 82 vehicles on our roads. Our big concern is the curvy s-turn on CR 16 between the proposed entrance to the new subdivision and our Red Hawk Village neighborhood. This road has very narrow shoulders with no sidewalks. It is already dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists who travel this road, and adding so many more vehicles to the road without also adding pedestrian options will only further this endangerment.

5. Affordability. As residents of Routt County, we are all too aware of the housing crisis that our community faces. We want to support measures that help provide more options for our fellow community members, especially teachers, police, firefighters, nurses, and all those who are so vital to our community. We recognize that the county is desperate to latch on to any solutions that might help curb this crisis, and we are very supportive of some of the actions

that are being taken, including evaluation of short term rental restrictions and development of income-restricted housing. However, we don't believe that this proposed subdivision is a solution to the affordable housing crisis. While we haven't seen proposed pricing on the units in question, we do know that newly constructed single family homes in our area are going for well over \$1M - far out of reach for the teachers and nurses we need in this community. I would urge the Board of Commissioners to take a long, hard look at whether this subdivision actually helps their cause, or simply brings more affluent and second home owners to the area.

We recognize that growth of the Stagecoach community is inevitable. We simply ask that the developers be considerate and respectful of the communities that they are impacting by acknowledging our concerns and working with local residents to try to minimize impacts where possible. We are more than willing to work together with the developer to collaborate on solutions that minimize these impacts.

Thank you,

Molly and Nate Wojcik

23710 Sagebrush Cir
Oak Creek, CO 80467

On Mon, Aug 29, 2022 at 11:12 AM Double H Management

<info@doublehmanagement.net> wrote:

Jim Zimmerman requested this email blast to all the owners at Red Hawk Village to attend an upcoming meeting regarding the development behind RHV. We need everyone to attend and object to the development behind us. Thanks (Jim)

Planning Commission meeting

September 1st at 6pm

Commissioners Hearing Room Old Courthouse.

--

Sue Hochreiter, Assoc Mgr

Double H Management

info@doublehmanagement.net

(970)-879-6697

P.O. Box 774444

Steamboat Springs, CO

80477

From: [Tom Cisar](#)
To: [Alan Goldich](#)
Subject: Landaulet Subdivision Planning Project # PL20220050
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 5:32:11 PM

Alan,

Please replace my previous letter concerning this project with this one.

Thank you,
Tom Cisar

Hello Alan,

As owner of my residence adjacent to the newly proposed Landaulet subdivision (Planning Project #PL20220050), I am writing to publicly object to the development plans as they have been proposed. I live at 23730 Sagebrush Cir, in the Red Hawk Village subdivision, which is located directly south of one of the fourplex units that has been proposed. I am not able to attend the live planning commission meeting that is scheduled for tomorrow (Sept. 1) but would still like the opportunity to voice my concerns about this project.

My primary concerns are as follows:

1. Disregard for Stagecoach Community Plan. As was expressed at previous hearings for the Snokomo Estates and Landaulet subdivisions, I am very disappointed in the complete disregard by the Routt County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners in upholding the Stagecoach community's wishes for our beloved community. A detailed description of the specific sections of the community plan that I find this development to be in violation of can be found in the letter that was previously submitted by the SPOA Board of Directors to the Routt County Planning Commission on May 27, 2021. What's the point in having a community plan at all if it's just going to be blatantly ignored? Decisions like these by our elected officials foster an environment of mistrust in our officials and civic processes and set a dangerous precedent for future decisions surrounding any community planning initiatives.

2. Density, building heights, and setbacks. The density of residences on the proposed plans is far higher than was originally proposed, and is very concerning. Furthermore, the plans do not include the height of the fourplex units, which is critical to understand the impact to my viewscapes. Currently my home has an unimpeded view to the lake, which adds a significant amount of value to my home and my neighbors' homes. Removing these views will directly impact my property values. An additional concern is adherence to proper setbacks from my property lines. As I understand it, the visible flagging that has been installed on the proposed development site indicates where the roads will be, and it's difficult to envision how a fourplex unit will fit between there and my property line with the required setback allowances. I'd like to understand any options available to work with the builder to minimize all of these impacts. Not only will my property lose economic value, it will severely impact my enjoyment of my property taking away the open space and views I now have.

4. Traffic impact. To my knowledge, there have been no traffic impact assessments performed for the addition of 41 residences. If we figure 2 cars per household, we're looking at an additional 82 vehicles on our roads. My big concern is the curvy s-turn on CR 16 between the proposed entrance to the new subdivision and our Red Hawk Village neighborhood. This road has very narrow shoulders with no sidewalks. It is already dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists who travel this road, and adding so many more vehicles to the road without also adding pedestrian options will only further this endangerment. I cycle this road almost daily.

5. Affordability. As residents of Routt County, I am all too aware of the housing crisis that our community faces. I want to support measures that help provide more options for my fellow community members, especially teachers, police, firefighters, nurses, and all those who are so vital to our community. I recognize that the county is desperate to latch on to any solutions that might help curb this crisis, and I am very supportive of some of the actions that are being taken, including evaluation of short term rental restrictions and development of income-restricted housing. However, I don't believe that this proposed subdivision is a solution to the affordable housing

crisis. While I haven't seen proposed pricing on the units in question, I do know that newly constructed single family homes in my area are going for well over \$750,000 - far out of reach for the teachers and nurses we need in this community. I would urge the Board of Commissioners to take a long, hard look at whether this subdivision actually helps their cause, or simply brings more affluent and second home owners to the area. It seems to me that an enclave of tiny homes would do much more to provide affordable housing than this proposed project and would at least provide lower profile structures that would have less of an impact on the Red Hawk Subdivision sight lines.

6. Today's economy. I bought my property in 2009 after the housing market collapsed. This left many unbuilt foundations in the area. Two of which were in Red Hawk Village. Those foundations were poured in 2006 and not built until 2015. I read articles everyday by economists predicting a recession is on the way starting either in the fourth quarter of this year or in the first half of 2023. My worst fear is that this project will start, the economy will collapse and I will have a tremendous eye sore out my backyard that will take a decade to come to fruition dropping my property value even more.

I recognize that growth of the Stagecoach community is inevitable. I simply ask that the developers be considerate and respectful of the communities that they are impacting by acknowledging my concerns and working with local residents to try to minimize impacts where possible. I am more than willing to work together with the developer to collaborate on solutions that minimize these impacts.

Thank you,

Tom Cisar

23730 Sagebrush Cir
Oak Creek, CO 80467

From: [Mike](#)
To: [Alan Goldich](#)
Subject: Landaulet Subdivision - stagecoach
Date: Thursday, September 1, 2022 6:00:40 PM

Hello,

I am a homeowner at Redhawk. I disapprove of the plans for many reasons. I am upset at how close the building envelope is to our community. I think this project is not in line with the rural area and should be kept at low density. I'm worried about air quality and dust during the project and the toxic smell of black top while paving. I am not happy about having a road right out my backdoor and noise and smell of the traffic, as well as decreased safety of our backyards. We think this project will decrease our home value and decrease our privacy and quiet enjoyment of the property.

We strongly recommend denying this project and the property should be kept at low density.

Sincerely,
Mike & Carolyn Dieter

Dear Mr. Goldich,

As neighbors concerned about the Landaulet Subdivision we would like to submit thoughts and questions for the September 1, 2022 hearing. Unfortunately, we will not be able to attend the hearing in person.

Of primary concern is the zoning change from general density to medium density and what that means for existing neighbors and the impact to Morrison Creek Water District.

First, to address the change to medium density. I see in the drawings labeled 8.11.22 on the Routt County website that there are seven fourplexes indicated but the 6.21.22 [Steamboat Pilot Article](#) cited that only four fourplexes were to be built after a revision at the April meeting. Could you please clarify how many fourplexes are being discussed and which drawing is most current? The impact of such high density housing in the backyards of our neighbors is of concern to us as it degrades both property value and quality of life. A suggested compromise would be to have single family homes bordering the existing single family homes to maintain the character of the area for current residents while providing some density to the developer.

Second, I would like to address our concerns regarding the impact to sewer permits in the Morrison Creek Water District. It is my understanding that all Stagecoach Property Owners Association (SPOA) areas have a limited number of vault permits and that this will restrict the development of residential lots that are currently owned and awaiting development. In fact, the Morningside subdivision has only 6 vault permits left ([Routt County Regional Planning Commission 7.16.2009](#)). This system was put in place to develop the Stagecoach area and avoid outpacing the ability of Morrison Creek Water District to handle sewage. With the zoning change from general to medium density is it responsible to create additional sewage demand in one area while SPOA properties suffer damages from a system designed to curtail demand?

Third, following the logic from above, there is a limit on well permits in the SPOA jurisdiction to avoid the over appropriation of water. As we know, water is only becoming scarcer in our environment and the system is well intentioned to limit water use and development to what is sustainable in the watershed. As recently as 2017 the Colorado Division of Water Resources temporarily suspended well permits in this same area and declared the Upper Yampa River over appropriated ([Steamboat Pilot and Today 3.17.2018](#)). How is an increase in water usage via increased zoning density responsible given that it circumvents existing limits to system use?

Last, I propose a percentage of developed housing be deed restricted to help our community add to its affordable housing stock. This could be in the form of prohibiting short term rentals, requiring primary residency, capping appreciation or requiring owners to work in Routt County. Even the ill fated West Steamboat development agreed to donate land to satisfy the community

need for affordable housing ([West Steamboat Neighborhoods Annexation](#)). As Beth Melton said “We need housing; we need diversity of housing.” ([Steamboat Pilot and Today 6.21.21](#)). This would ensure diversity of housing and be a small win for the community. I propose a win-win for both developer and community. Every unit that was gained by the switch from general density to medium density should be deed restricted to ensure affordability in our community. In this scenario, the community wins affordable housing and the developer wins the ability to use medium density.

In summary, we oppose fourplexes bordering existing single family homes, are concerned about damages to existing undeveloped residential lot owners due to over appropriation of resources and propose that the commissioners tackle the most prominent issue of this decade - affordable housing.

Best regards,

Mark vonSchondorf
Kayleen Cohen
23610 Sagebrush Circle, Oak Creek, CO 80467

From: [Molly Wojcik](#)
To: [Alan Goldich](#)
Cc: [Nate Wojcik](#)
Subject: Fwd: Public comment on Landaulet Subdivision; Planning Project #PL20220050
Date: Wednesday, August 31, 2022 8:54:30 AM
Attachments: [SPOA-05272021163651 Landaulet.pdf](#)
[SKETCH SUBDIVISION PLAN - LANDAULET 8-10-2022.pdf](#)

Hello Alan,

As owners of property adjacent to the newly proposed Landaulet subdivision (Planning Project #PL20220050), we are writing to publicly object to the development plans as they have been proposed. We live at 23710 Sagebrush Cir, in the Red Hawk Village subdivision, which is located directly south of one of the fourplex units that has been proposed. We are not able to attend the live planning commission meeting that is scheduled for tomorrow (Sept. 1) but would still like the opportunity to voice our concerns around this project.

Our primary concerns are as follows:

1. Disregard for Stagecoach Community Plan. As was expressed at previous hearings for the Snokomo Estates and Landaulet subdivisions, we're very disappointed in the complete disregard by the Routt County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners in upholding the Stagecoach community's wishes for our beloved community. A detailed description of the specific sections of the community plan that we find this development to be in violation of can be found in the attached letter that was previously submitted by the SPOA Board of Directors to the Routt County Planning Commission on May 27, 2021. What's the point in having a community plan at all if it's just going to be blatantly ignored? Decisions like these by our elected officials foster an environment of mistrust in our officials and civic processes and set a dangerous precedent for future decisions surrounding any community planning initiatives.

2. Density, building heights, and setbacks. The density of residences on the proposed plans (referenced in attachment) is far higher than was originally proposed, and is very concerning. Furthermore, the plans do not include the height of the fourplex units, which is critical to understand the impact to our viewscapes. Currently our home has an unimpeded view to the lake, which adds a significant amount of value to our home and our neighbors' homes. Removing these views will directly impact our property values. An additional concern is adherence to proper setbacks from our property lines. As we understand it, the visible flagging that has been installed on the proposed development site indicates where the roads will be, and it's difficult to envision how a fourplex unit will fit between there and our property line with the required setback allowances. We'd like to understand any options available to work with the builder to minimize all of these impacts.

4. Traffic impact. To our knowledge, there have been no traffic impact assessments performed for the addition of 41 residences. If we figure 2 cars per household, we're looking at an additional 82 vehicles on our roads. Our big concern is the curvy s-turn on CR 16 between the proposed entrance to the new subdivision and our Red Hawk Village neighborhood. This road has very narrow shoulders with no sidewalks. It is already dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists who travel this road, and adding so many more vehicles to the road without also adding pedestrian options will only further this endangerment.

5. Affordability. As residents of Routt County, we are all too aware of the housing crisis that our community faces. We want to support measures that help provide more options for our fellow community members, especially teachers, police, firefighters, nurses, and all those who are so vital to our community. We recognize that the county is desperate to latch on to any solutions that might help curb this crisis, and we are very supportive of some of the actions that are being taken, including evaluation of short term rental restrictions and development of income-restricted housing. However, we don't believe that this proposed subdivision is a solution to the affordable housing crisis. While we haven't seen proposed pricing on the units in question, we do know that newly constructed single family homes in our area are going for well over \$1M - far out of reach for the teachers and nurses we need in this community. I would urge the Board of Commissioners to take a long, hard look at whether this subdivision actually helps their cause, or simply brings more affluent and second home owners to the area.

We recognize that growth of the Stagecoach community is inevitable. We simply ask that the developers be considerate and respectful of the communities that they are impacting by acknowledging our concerns and working with local residents to try to minimize impacts where possible. We are more than willing to work together with the developer to collaborate on solutions that minimize these impacts.

Thank you,

Molly and Nate Wojcik

23710 Sagebrush Cir
Oak Creek, CO 80467



The Law Office of Sarah D. Claassen, P.C.

May 27, 2021

VIA EMAIL: agoldich@co.routt.co.us

Routt County Planning Commission
c/o Alan Goldich
136 6th Street
Steamboat Springs, CO 80487

RE: PL-21-108 and 109 Landaulet Subdivision

Dear Planning Commission:

This office represents Stagecoach Property Owners Association. This letter is written on behalf of the Association as an objection to the rezoning request made in the above-referenced development application. The application requests, as part of approval for the development plan, a change from general residential zoning to mountain medium density.

As you know, a four short years ago, the Board of County Commissioners adopted an updated Stagecoach Community Plan after extensive and intensive input from all stakeholders including Stagecoach Property Owners Association. As stated on page 28 of the Plan (Section 5.1) the 2016 Plan update is intended to be a guideline for land use and development decisions within Stagecoach.

The current zoning is general residential which provides for minimum lot sizes for one to two families of one-half (1/2) acre. As we understand, the parcels under consideration, consist of 5.53 acres. Taking into account area needed for roads and other planned amenities, we believe it would allow for not more than six to eight units. The request for zoning change to medium density residential appears to be somewhat unlimited and the plan calls for 14 residential units, significantly increasing the residential impact.

428 Oak Street
P.O. Box 774064 Steamboat Springs, Colorado 80477
Phone (970) 879-8405 Facsimile (970) 879-8325
Email: sdcl@femail-lawyer.com

The concern is that the siting and location of these parcels and the increased density will significantly negatively impact the view corridors of existing development. We bring to your attention the following portions of the Stagecoach Community Plan:

Section 5.1: The core values of the Stagecoach Community are as follows:

- Preserve open spaces and scenic views to the best extent practicable.

Section 5.5.2.

B. New development should attempt to minimize the detraction from the rural character and scenic vistas in Stagecoach.

C. Inform Stagecoach owners of the importance of preserving view corridors and of regulations requiring visual mitigation of proposed skyline structures.

We also bring to the Commission's attention the following:

Section 6.2.1 New Approvals Consistent with the Plan. The County will evaluate development proposals for conformity of the adopted plan. If proposals to plat, replat, or rezone land are consistent with this plan, approval is likely. It is the position of SPOA that rezoning land for the sole purpose of increasing density in a visual sensitive area is inconsistent with the Community Plan.

We would like to emphasize that the Stagecoach Community Plan was a comprehensive effort and its guidelines and intent should be rigorously followed. In our experience, developers can always find a reason to ask exception from a community or master plan. However, if exceptions are routinely granted, there is no longer a plan. We do note that these parcels were only purchased in November 2020. They were purchased with full knowledge of the zoning of the parcels and the intents and visions of the Stagecoach Community Plan. It is only equitable to the existing owners and residents of Stagecoach that the expectations of the community as elaborated in the Community Plan be met. Therefore we do request the Planning Commission to recommend denial of the zoning change for this project.

Sincerely,



Sarah D. Claassen

SDC/lml

cc: SPOA Board of Directors

Sarah Woodmansee
31280 Broken Talon Trl
Stagecoach

I am a 17 year resident of Routt County, and a 16 year resident of Eagle's Watch, which sits behind the property being considered.

I firmly believe that Routt County ought to follow the old adage "build it and they will come". Infrastructure improvement in terms of CR14, support and encouragement for small businesses, and enhanced school district opportunities should be the first and foremost concerns when considering population growth. My concerns are foundational, not just being a "NIMBY", even though the area in question is actually, in many respects, my backyard.

- a) The proposed subdivision has serious costs to us as members of SPOA, who will be charged with trail traffic and maintenance if use is increased by new tenants and homeowners of this subdivision whether or not it is included as a SPOA development.
- b) There is a concern for county road maintenance required while moving between Steamboat Springs and Stagecoach: the lack of road shoulders currently on Yellowjacket Pass (County Road 14), yield hazards for bicyclists as well as auto drivers every season. Particularly during winter months, CR14 can present a serious problem as snow and windblown snow often brings with it reduced visibility, and a large workload for county graders on County Road 16 and 14, which would seriously increase.
- c). The CR 14 road as well as the bridge at the Yampa River inlet are in seriously poor condition and require widening and rebuilding if more traffic is foreseen. Access to this proposed subdivision as well as all other growth in the Stagecoach area can be cut in the event of a wildfire if County Road 16 is closed. This has happened in the past and the bridge (CR16) at the inlet to Stagecoach Reservoir still requires upgrading to allow for heavy firefighting apparatus when providing a staging area for fire tanker water.
- d) Wildlife. There is no provision for wildlife movement in this density of housing or in its placement which can serve in part as a path to and from water in the Reservoir.
- e) As shown in the sketch, open space and a dog park are too small to provide sensible acreage for their purposes. Dog parks visited over the past several years are several acres. A setback of ten feet should not be acceptable. If a community fire occurs, it would not provide for fire safety or the normal activities of family life, (snow removal, exterior maintenance), etc.
- f) What would the price points be in considering these as affordable? What guarantees are there from the developers that this enterprise (Funds in escrow at the beginning) will carry out their plans if they are enabled? Current financial forecasts indicate a tighter housing market will soon be on the way as interest rates are increased, just as was the case in the original Stagecoach plan.

Finally, there is no reference to increased business development in the Stagecoach area that would be afforded to people who currently and potentially live in this area.

Make no mistake, this growth would only serve the one industry currently existing under the heading of "affordable housing". More clearly, this issue has devolved from two economies: Real estate development and recreation provided by Steamboat Springs Ski Resort. An ethical question arises: Should all of Routt County and Stagecoach subsidize these economies (skiing and tourism?). What is the payback versus the cost of providing an income to a few sectors?

I am officially an elderly person, I doubt I will be here to see this development to completion, and I have a question for the commission: Does this idea fill the future needs of Routt County, or does it serve to line pockets of persons who will never live here? Who is this plan serving and what will be outcome in 10 years?

I appreciate your attention and hope my concerns are addressed by thoughtful deliberations. I will also be hopeful of having a response from you addressing them as well.

Sincerely

Sarah R. Woodmansee

sarahrwoodmansee@gmail.com.



These are photos from our ground level patio on the rear of our home at Red Hawk. Our view of the sprawling land and Reservoir will be eliminated. The entire ambiance and peacefulness and joy of living here will be destroyed by this eyesore



ROUTT COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

September 1, 2022

The regular meeting of the Routt County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with the following members present: Chairman Steve Warnke and Commissioners Brian Kelly, Bill Norris, Jim DeFrancia, Greg Jaeger, Linda Miller, Andrew Benjamin, and Paul Weese. Commissioner Ren Martyn was absent. Planning Director Kristy Winsor and staff planner Alan Goldich also attended. Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

MINUTES – August 4, 2022

Commissioner Kelly moved to approve the above cited minutes, as written. Commissioner Miller seconded the motion. **The motion carried 8 – 0, with the Chair voting yes.**

ACTIVITY: PL20220050

PETITIONER: Eagle Mountain Land Development, LLC

PETITION: Sketch Subdivision for a proposed medium density residential development project

LOCATION: LOT 8, SNOKOMO ESTATES; LOT 9, SNOKOMO ESTATES FILING 2; LOT 9A, SNOKOMO ESTATES FILING 2; LOT 9B, SNOKOMO ESTATES FILING 2; located approximately .5 miles east of the intersection of CR 16 and CR 212

Mr. Joe Wiedemeier of Four Point Surveying and Engineering, representing the petitioner, presented a site plan of the proposed residential development. He stated that Lot 8 is currently zoned High Density Residential (HDR) and that Lots 9, 9A and B are zoned General Residential (GR). He said that some earthwork has been done Lots 9, 9A and 9B to rough in the roads. He reviewed the proposal that would include five single-family residences, four duplexes and seven fourplexes, adding that this development would provide a wide range of housing types as well as open space and amenities. Mr. Wiedemeier said that 27% of the total acreage would remain as open space and would include a dog park, a playground and trails. Mr. Weidemeier presented a detailed site plan and indicated the location of these features, as well as the overflow parking areas. He said that the plan has taken into consideration future development and connectivity. He said that the development is in character with the surrounding developments. He stated that the proposal is in line with the Stagecoach Area Community Plan (SCAP), the Routt County Master Plan and the Routt County subdivision standards. No variances or exceptions will be requested. Mr. Weidemeier reviewed the infrastructure that would serve the development, including roads, water, sewer, and stormwater management.

In response to a question from Commissioner Kelly, Mr. Weidemeier confirmed that the roads would be paved, and that the south road would be 24' wide within a 30' right of way.

Commissioner Jaeger asked about the size of the dog park. Mr. Goldich said that area designated for the dog park is approximately 3200 sq. ft.

Commissioner Norris asked about the use of the open space and trails. Mr. Weidemeier said that they would be open to the public.

Chairman Warnke asked about the size of the fourplex units. Mr. Weidemeier that they would be in the 1200 – 1500 sq. ft. range, not including the garages.

Mr. Goldich noted that this is a Sketch Subdivision, which is conceptual in nature and is intended to determine the overall compliance of the proposal with the applicable plans. The review at this level is also intended to provide feedback to the applicant regarding suggested modifications and considerations for the next level of review. He stated that staff is recommending approval with the suggested Conditions of Approval (COAs).

Mr. Goldich reviewed the history of the property. In 1998, the Board approved Snokomo Estates F2, a subdivision of Lot 9 into the three lots (9, 9A, and 9B). Also at that time, a zone change from HDR to GR was approved for the three lots. In 2008 the Board approved Snokomo F3, a further subdivision of the current Lot 9 into two lots, however, the plat has not been recorded. A deadline for recording the plat was included in the approval but the previous owner requested several extensions of the deadline to record the plat. Each of these requests were granted. The current deadline to have the Snokomo F3 final plat recorded is July 8, 2024. The landowner is vested in the approval from 2008 as long as extensions to the deadline to record the plat are approved. In 2021, Lots 9, 9A, and 9B Snokomo Estates was approved for a Sketch Subdivision and Zone Change to Medium Density Residential.

Mr. Goldich reviewed the proposal that would allow for a total of 41 units on the 9.11-acre parcel. He stated that the number of single family homes to be located on the hill was reduced from six to five compared to the 2021 approval. The four duplex lots would all be on the side of the hill and the seven fourplexes would be located at the bottom of the hill. The fourplex units would each have a detached garage. Mr. Goldich reviewed the parking plan, the location of the trails, common area, dogpark and playground.

Mr. Goldich stated that this application was submitted prior to the adoption of the new 2022 Master Plan, and so was reviewed under the 2003 Master Plan. He noted that in the 2003 Master Plan, Stagecoach was designated as a Potential Growth Center because of its existing platting, zoning (including Commercial), a special district, and an approved sub-area plan. In the 2022 Master Plan it is designated as a Tier II Target Growth Area because it has an approved sub-area plan, platted lots, zoning appropriate for higher density development, and a special district to support infrastructure to accommodate new growth. He stated that the Morrison Creek Metropolitan Water and Sanitation District has stated that its system has capacity to serve the proposed development. Mr. Goldich stated that page 5 of the SCAP states that the SCAP is advisory in nature and intended to serve as a guide for future development.

Mr. Goldich stated that six letters of opposition to the proposal had been received, all after the staff report was distributed. One letter was received prior to the cut off for consideration at this hearing. Mr. Goldich said that all of the letters would be included in the packet for the Board of County

Commissioners' hearing. Mr. Goldich stated that most of the comments were with regard to negative visual impacts, particularly of the fourplex units, general non-compliance with the SCAP, density, traffic, and affordability. He said that if the application moves forward, a detailed traffic study would be a requirement at the Preliminary Subdivision review. He said that the Routt County Subdivision Regulations do not mention affordability and there are no standards that require this. Regarding density, Mr. Goldich stated that the issues for consideration are whether the proposed density is appropriate for this location and whether the proposal would create negative visual impacts that cannot be mitigated.

Commissioner Benjamin asked about the status of the 2021 approval for development on Lots 9, 9A and 9B. Mr. Goldich stated that the approval was of the Sketch Subdivision. That proposal would then need to go through Preliminary and Final approval before anything could be constructed. If the current petition is approved, it would supersede the 2021 approval. In response to a question from Commissioner Jaeger, Mr. Goldich stated that the zone change for those lots was approved, but was to be recorded in conjunction with the plat.

Commissioner Kelly asked about the setbacks for the fourplex buildings. Mr. Goldich acknowledged that the Routt County Subdivision Regulations are not set up for multi-family projects, so the setbacks would be based on the overall project property boundaries. In the HDR zone district the minimum setbacks are 15' from the front and rear property lines and 10' from the side property lines. Commissioner Kelly expressed concern that there would not be sufficient room within the right of way to accommodate the road and snow storage.

There was discussion of landscaping. Commissioner Benjamin noted that there are not standards for landscaping, so it is up to the applicant to propose a plan. Chairman Warnke suggested that the COA regarding landscaping should be clarified.

Commissioner Jaeger asked for a comparison of the density of this proposal to other nearby residential developments. Mr. Goldich stated that Red Hawk Village has 29 single-family residences on 3 acres; Eagle's Watch has a total of 32 units on 6.8 acres. The proposal is for 41 units on 9 acres. Mr. Goldich presented a map of the area and indicated the location of various subdivisions as well as the zoning in the vicinity of the proposed development. The majority of the surrounding areas are zoned HDR.

Public Comment

Mr. James Zimmerman, a resident of Red Hawk Village, asked about the height of the proposed fourplex units. Mr. Weidemeier stated that the dimensions of the buildings had not yet been determined. Mr. Zimmerman stated that these fourplex buildings are proposed to be located right at the edge of the property that borders all the homes along Sagebrush Trail, and if they are two-story buildings, which is likely for a fourplex, they will completely block the views from all of the homes on the backside of Red Hawk. He stated that the people who bought their home in Red Hawk did so because of the open space, views, and amenities. Mr. Zimmerman cited the ability to hike and ski to the reservoir, view wildlife, and enjoy the open space. He said all of this would be blocked by the proposed multi-family buildings. He stated that the proposal is not in conformity with the SCAP and that the development would negatively impact their property values. He said that the proposal would be an eyesore and asked Planning Commission to deny it.

Mr. Bob Woodmansee, a resident of Eagle's Watch, said that although he would not be directly impacted by the proposed development, he was concerned about the visual impact of the proposal as seen from CR 16. He said that the proposal contains too many buildings and would block the views of the reservoir. He also expressed concern that the homes on the hill would be skylined. Mr. Woodmansee said that the proposed dog park was too small to be useful and expressed concern with the traffic impact of the development on CR 16 and CR 14. He stated that the problems on these roads are something that the County should address, regardless of whether these 41 units are approved or not. Mr. Woodmansee noted that CPW had commented on the Columbian Sharp-tailed Grouse habitat in the vicinity and offered that the impact on habitat cannot be mitigated. He said that the proposal would constitute habitat fragmentation.

Mr. Chris Belton, a resident of Red Hawk Village stated his opposition to the project, citing the negative visual impacts of the development. He stated that all of the homes in the area have been situated to have views, and that the impact of the proposed development could not be mitigated. He stated that the development would have a negative impact on property values. He said that he had also spoken in opposition to the proposal approved in 2021. Mr. Belton offered that his comments are more than NIMBY-ism because the impact of the proposal is exacerbated by the topography. He said that because the property is higher than Red Hawk, it would have an exaggerated impact, which is different than the other multi-family developments in the area. He said that the development would affect many neighborhoods, not just Red Hawk Village. He cited the SCAP which states that new development should minimize its impact on existing property owners.

Ms. Sarah Woodmansee, a resident of Eagle's Watch, stated that she is increasingly concerned with wildfire hazards and expressed concern that the proposed minimal setbacks and multi-family structures would increase fire danger. She offered that the design did not include a safety plan.

Ms. Betsy Blakeslee, a resident of the south side of Red Hawk Village, acknowledged that her comment was a NIMBY comment. She stated that the proposed development would literally be in her backyard. She said that the most significant impact would not be the high density, but rather the impact on the views and the aesthetics, which all who live in Stagecoach value highly. She said that she is very concerned with how close the proposed buildings would be to the existing homes in Red Hawk. She offered that a compromise could be reached that could increase the open space and allow for better aesthetics.

Ms. Alisa Bonelli, a resident of the north side of Red Hawk Village, stated her agreement with all of the previous comments regarding the impact of the proposal on the views, wildlife habitat and the need for a compromise. She expressed concern with the proximity of the trail and the buildings to her yard and noted that SPOA does not allow the construction of privacy fences. She said that the proposed structures are just too close to the existing homes and asked that Planning Commission deny the petition.

Ms. Barbara Fox, a resident of Red Hawk Village, stated her opposition to the project, citing the topography and the visual impact of building on the ridge. She agreed that the proposed development would be way too close to the existing homes, and that there were too many roads and too many buildings, particularly when you consider all of the garages.

Ms. Rose Zimmerman, a resident of Red Hawk Village, urged Planning Commission to visit the site prior to making any decision regarding the proposal. She said that better information was needed and that the impact of the proposal could not be fairly assessed without seeing it on the ground.

Mr. Mike Dieter, a resident of Red Hawk Village, stated his agreement with the previous comments. He agreed that the trail was too close to the existing homes and that the dog park was too small. He agreed that the project would impact property values, privacy, and views. He offered that the proposal was too dense for the location and does not seem to fit the character of what is already there. Mr. Dieter added that he is concerned with the impact on traffic and the impact of the construction. He said that the proposal should be modified to create more open space.

Seeing no further comment, Chairman Warnke closed public comment.

Mr. Goldich acknowledged that any new development would have impacts, and stated that the review of the application is limited to land use. He said that property values are not within the purview of the County's review and cannot be considered. Mr. Goldich stated that although staff is sympathetic with the potential impacts of the development, the owner of the subject property also has rights, and has the right to apply to develop the property. He described the levels of review of a subdivision proposal and said that not all details are required at the Sketch review. He offered that the County's goal is to provide consistency in the process. He discussed the outreach that had been conducted for the update of the Master Plan and noted that Stagecoach was determined to be a Tier II Target Growth Area because it has the infrastructure and capacity to accommodate growth. He noted that the proposal is for 9 acres; the SCAP covers an 11,000 acre area. Mr. Goldich said that the proposal would be visible from CR 16, but that it is not considered to be skylined because Blacktail Mountain rises behind it.

In response to a question from Commissioner DeFrancia, Mr. Goldich clarified the status of the 2021 Sketch Subdivision approval and stated that Lot 8 is zoned HDR, which has a minimum lot size per unit of 3,000 sq. ft., which would allow for a maximum of 51 units. The HDR zoning has been in place since 1972.

Commissioner Norris stated that Stagecoach has been designated as a potential growth center for some time, and that the new designation of Tier II Future Growth Area confirms that status. He acknowledged that there are bottlenecks with the traffic pattern that serves the area, but offered that many of the fire and safety concerns were addressed when the Stagecoach fire station was built.

Chairman Warnke noted that staff had identified density for the site and visual impacts as the issues to be addressed by Planning Commission. He stated that there is no question that the project would have visual impacts, but offered that the applicant has the opportunity to adjust the design at the next level of review. He noted, however, that the HDR zoning has been in place for a very long time. He suggested that the impact of the development might be mitigated, but that any development on the property would have an impact on the views of the neighbors.

Commissioner Benjamin noted that Red Hawk Village has 29 structures, whereas the proposed development would have 14, plus garages. He stated that he would support approving the proposal at the Sketch level, but agreed that the snow storage as well as the road and right of way should

be considered and, perhaps redesigned. He stated that the applicant should present a landscaping plan. He offered that this proposal is for only 9 acres out of the huge area covered by the SCAP. He said that his opinion on the proposal would depend on the details that are not available at this stage of review.

Commissioner Miller stated that she sympathizes with the current residents, but noted that the HDR zoning has been in place since 1972 and there has always been the potential for development of this area. She said that the proposal is for the development of private property at a density far below what is allowed by the zoning. She offered, however, that the developer needs to listen to the comments by the neighbors and work to mitigate the concerns in the next iteration.

Commissioner DeFrancia stated that Planning Commission's decision regarding whether to recommend approval of a petition are based on the existing zoning, land use regulations and codes. He stated that the property owner has rights, but agreed that the developer needs to pay attention to the concerns. He strongly encouraged the developer to mitigate the impacts of the development, but acknowledged that the property would be developed.

Commissioner Weese offered that the petitioner had proposed a clean plan for development and that project was making the best use of the property. He stated that he wants to see a landscaping plan and that he appreciates the concerns regarding the setbacks.

Commissioner Kelly stated that his main comments were with the dimensions. He offered that the spacing was too tight to accommodate the road and snow storage. He also suggested that placing lower buildings near the property line could help to mitigate the impact.

Commissioner Jaeger offered that the proposed development is within the existing community character, which includes nearby multi-family developments with similar densities. He said that the existing zoning, which would allow 51 units on Lot 8 should be the standard of comparison, not the open space that is there now. He noted that he proposal is for half the density that would be allowed under the HDR zoning. He agreed that placing the lower structures near Red Hawk Village and allowing more room for the trail would help to mitigate the impacts.

Chairman Warnke suggested that the developer had been given a good sense of the concerns and direction for redesigning the project. He added that traffic in Stagecoach is a real concern and that language should be added to COA 6h regarding the impact of the additional traffic on both CR 16 and CR 14. He said that COA 6c should also be modified to specifically address the mitigation of the negative visual impacts.

Commissioner Benjamin discussed the layout of the project and acknowledged that Red Hawk Village would be most affected by any development of the property. He said that he would need to see the massing of the structures, the roof lines, etc., before he could evaluate the project. He added that the multi-family units might provide some attainable housing opportunities, which might increase the number of students at the Soroco schools.

Chairman Warnke offered that the need to address the road widths and snow storage may create a compromise that would allow more space.

Commissioner Miller stressed that the prohibition on short-term rentals must be included in the project covenants.

MOTION

Commissioner DeFrancia moved to recommend approval of item PL20220050, a Sketch Subdivision on Lots 8 Snokomo Estates, and Lots 9, 9A and 9B of Snokomo Estates F2 with the following findings of fact:

1. The proposal with the following conditions meets the applicable guidelines of the Stagecoach Community Plan, particularly:
 - 1) 5.2.2.B, C, and E
 - 2) 5.3.1.1.A
 - 3) 5.4.1.B and E
 - 4) 5.5.1.A, D, H, and J
 - 5) 5.6.1.A and B
2. The proposal with the following conditions meets the applicable guidelines of the Routt County Master Plan, particularly:
 - 1) 3.3.C
 - 2) 4.3.D
 - 3) 6.3.H
 - 4) 9.3.F
 - 5) 11.3.F, G, J, O, and W

This approval is subject to the following conditions:

General Conditions:

1. This Sketch Subdivision Plan approval is contingent on submittal of a complete application for a Preliminary Subdivision Plan within twelve (12) months. Extension of up to one (1) year may be approved administratively.
2. All federal, state and local permits shall be obtained, including but not limited to: Grading And Excavating, Work in the Right of Way, and Access permits
3. Prior to recordation, the applicant shall submit an electronic copy of the approved plat to the County Planning Department in a format acceptable to the GIS Department.
4. All property taxes must be paid prior to the recording of the final plat.
5. If applicable, the right of way for County Road 16 shall be appropriately dedicated on the final plat.
6. The Preliminary Plan submittal shall include the following detailed information:
 - a. Utility plans produced by a registered Colorado Engineer per the 2016 Routt County Road & Bridge Roadway Standards (roads, water, sewer, fire hydrants, grading and drainage, utilities, etc.)
 - b. Soils report

- c. Landscaping plan including significant efforts to mitigate views from surrounding properties
 - d. All lot dimensions
 - e. Plan showing land to be dedicated as open space in conformance with Section 3.5.1 of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - f. Site plan showing land to be dedicated for public sites or calculation of payment in lieu in conformance with Section 3.5.2, 3.5.3, and 5.3.4 of the Subdivision Regulations.
 - g. Engineered drainage study of the site per 2016 Routt County Road & Bridge Roadway Standards.
 - h. A traffic study performed by a registered Colorado Engineer based upon the number of approved units with a particular focus on CR 14 and CR 16. Comments shall be obtained from Routt County Public Works, prior to submittal of the Preliminary Plan.
 - i. Road construction plans and specifications for the interior access road which meet the minimum requirements of the Oak Creek Fire Protection District, Routt County Public Works Director, and the Routt County Board of County Commissioners. Plans and specifications shall carefully consider minimizing cuts, fills and visual scarring.
 - j. Engineer drawings for connection to the central water and sewer system.
 - k. Draft Covenants
 - l. Wildlife Mitigation Plan approved by Colorado Parks and Wildlife.
 - m. Snow Storage plan based upon the City of Steamboat Springs' standards
 - n. Slope analysis of site with slopes greater than 30% identified
7. The Final Plat notes shall include, but are not limited to:
- a. Routt County is not responsible for maintaining or improving subdivision roads. The roads shown hereon have not been dedicated nor accepted by the County.
 - b. Existing and new accesses shall meet access standards set forth by the Routt County Public Works Department and Fire Prevention Services.
 - c. Routt County (County) and the Oak Creek Fire Protection District (District) shall be held harmless from any injury, damage, or claim that may be made against the County or the District by reason of the County's or the District's failure to provide ambulance, fire, rescue or police protection to the property described on this plat, provided that the failure to provide such services is due to inaccessibility of the property by reason of internal roads being impassable. This conditions shall not relieve the County or the District of their

responsibility to make a bona fide effort to provide emergency services should the need arise.

- d. All exterior lighting shall be downcast and opaquely shielded.
 - e. Address signage shall be in conformance with Routt County Road Addressing, Naming, and Signing Policy shall be located at the entrance to the driveway.
 - f. A current soils test showing that the soils are sufficiently stable to support development will be required before obtaining a building permit.
 - g. Revegetation of disturbed areas shall occur within one growing season with a seed mix that avoids the use of aggressive grassed. See the Colorado State University Extension Office for appropriate grass mixes.
 - h. All trails are open to the public.
8. A 'no build' zone shall be indicated on the plat to avoid construction of structures and roads in areas including, but not limited to 30% or greater slopes. The "no build" zones shall be defined on the plat and approved by the Planning Director before the plat is recorded.
9. The open space parcels shall be deeded to the property owners' association and such deed shall be recorded concurrently with the Final Plat. The plat shall indicate that the Open Space parcel is open to the public.
10. The Final Plat shall show a 10' public utility easements along the interior of all lot lines and such shall be dedicated appropriately.
11. Covenants shall include:
- a. Requirement to control noxious weeds
 - b. Roads will be privately maintained
 - c. No on street parking
 - d. All restrictions referenced in CPW's letter dated March 31, 2021
 - e. A restriction on short term rentals

Commissioner Norris seconded the motion.

The motion carried 8 – 0, with the Chair voting yes.

ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Ms. Winser stated that the Board had ratified the 2022 Master Plan. She said that all applications submitted after the ratification would be reviewed under the new plan. She added that outreach to present to new plan to the community and all stakeholders that had contributed to the update would begin soon. Ms. Winser said she had applied for a DOLA grant to provide matching funds to support the engagement of a consultant to assist with the update of the Zoning and Subdivision Regulations, which will be a very technical process. She said that they are hoping to have the consultant hired and ready to begin on January 1st.

Ms. Winser reviewed the upcoming agendas, including a presentation on solar energy development on August 15th.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

DRAFT