1. CALL TO ORDER

2. JOINT MEETING WITH BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. Consideration Of Approval Of Minutes From March 20, 2014
      Documents: 032014-pc-corrected.pdf

4. PUBLIC COMMENT
   Members of the public may address the Planning Commission on items not on the agenda. (Comments regarding items on the agenda will be taken during that agenda item.)

5. ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION
   A. Steamboat Stone Supply
      Activity #: PP2014-001
      Petition: Site Plan Review for stone supply
      Applicant: Steamboat Stone Supply
      Legal: 1 acre tract in Northeast ¼ Northwest ¼ lying east of Railroad ROW; Section 33 Township 6 Range 84
      Location: 35795 US Highway 40
      Documents: Staff Report 5.1.14.pdf

6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION
   A. New Commissioners Introduction And Orientation

7. ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

8. ADJOURNMENT

WiFi access is available in the Hearing Room, and agenda packets can be accessed at www.co.routt.co.us/AgendaCenter.

All programs, services and activities of Routt County are operated in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. If you need a special accommodation as a result of a disability, please call the Commissioners Office at (970) 879-0108 to assure that we can meet your needs. Please notify us of your request as soon as possible prior to the scheduled event. Routt County uses the Relay Colorado service. Dial 711 or TDD (970) 870-5444.
The regular meeting of the Routt County Planning Commission was called to order at 6:00 p.m. with the following members present: Chairman Jay Gallagher, Commissioners Brita Horn, Dick Klumker, Brian Arel, Steve Warnke and John Merrill. Commissioner John Ayer joined the meeting at 6:19. Commissioners Andrew Benjamin, Tom Effinger, Donna Hellyer and Bob Woodmansee were absent. Planning Director Chad Phillips, Assistant Planning Director Kristy Winser, City Planning Director Tyler Gibbs and City Planner Rebecca Bessey also attended. Sarah Katherman prepared the minutes from a recording of the meeting.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT
There was no public comment.

ACTIVITY: PI2011-001
PETITIONER: Routt County
PETITION: Discussion of the approval criteria for amendments to the Urban Growth Boundary
LOCATION: County wide

Chairman Gallagher introduced the work session, noting that no vote would be taken.

Ms. Winser stated that in addition to the materials provided in the packet and the letter submitted by Commissioner Ayer, letters had also been received from Ben Beall and from Rodger Steen, representing the Community Alliance of the Yampa Valley (CAYV). Ms. Winser reviewed that the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan (SSACP) contains a “Future Land Use Plan” that clearly defines the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). She presented a map and indicated the UGB. Ms. Winser stated that the UGB is a growth management mechanism designed to provide a hard edge between urban-style development in Steamboat Springs and rural Routt County. She stated that the UGB was originally established in 1995 to align with utility services, natural contours, view sheds and developable land. The UGB was altered in 1999 (with the West of Steamboat Springs Area Plan), 2004 and 2006. Ms. Winser offered the UGB has served to prevent urban sprawl and maintain the rural character of Routt County. She noted that there are parcels adjacent to the UGB that are served by City services and whose owners would like them to be annexed, but cannot be annexed unless they are within the UGB. Ms. Winser reviewed the existing criteria that must be met to amend the UGB (page 22 of the packet). She noted that City and County staff had been directed by City Council and the Board of County Commissioners to look at the criteria and determine whether the extreme difficulty of meeting the
criteria has made reasonable modifications to the UGB impossible. She reviewed the differences between the regulations for annexation and those for amending the UGB. Ms. Winser stated that annexation concerns the particulars of current growth, whereas the UGB concerns more general planning for future growth.

Chairman Gallagher asked if there was a problem that the proposed amendments have been designed to address, or whether the proposed amendments are intended to improve the process. He suggested that the changes originally proposed by City staff had shifted the issue away from the UGB and into annexation, thereby excluding the County from the decision making process. He offered Planning Commission had been clear at the last discussion that any amendments to the process must ensure that the County’s interests are protected. He stated that the proposed amendments to be discussed tonight simplify the process of minor changes to the UGB while maintaining the County’s involvement. Chairman Gallagher offered that the criteria for what distinguishes a major from a minor change have yet to be defined in a satisfactory way.

Ms. Winser noted that in response to the earlier discussion, staff has prepared a draft of what minor and major processes might look like. The draft was presented to City Planning Commission last week.

In response to a question from Commissioner Arel regarding the purpose of the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the City and the County, Mr. Phillips stated that the IGA provides a mutually beneficial planning process for both entities. He said that unlike most Colorado counties, Routt County does not have its own land use plan, but through the IGA the County can provide input into how the City of Steamboat Springs develops. City Planning Director Tyler Gibbs clarified that through the IGA, the City is only allowed to consider annexation of areas within the UGB. The UGB is set jointly by the City and the County. Chairman Gallagher added that the UGB is an element of the SSACP, which represents a joint vision for the City and the County.

Commissioner Warnke requested that staff discuss the list of previous applications for amendments to the UGB (all of which have been denied) and provide an example of a requested amendment to the UGB that might have been allowed under the proposed minor change process. Ms. Bessey reviewed Attachment 6 (page 25 of the packet) and noted that information regarding the requests and what was found to be inconsistent with the criteria was incomplete for some items. She suggested that although there has been much discussion about the criteria, and a general consensus that the bar was so high that no proposal could qualify, this is not really the reason for the reevaluation of the process. Ms. Bessey stated that the draft of the minor amendment process was not designed to fit any particular proposal or property. She added that staff had researched how other communities handle amendments to UGBs, and had found that it is not uncommon for there to be distinction between minor and major amendments. Ms. Bessey stated that it is difficult to be very specific in a policy
Ms. Bessey reviewed the flowchart describing the draft processes (page 21 of the fact packet). She noted that the minor amendment process would be the same as that used for all UGB amendments in the past. For major amendments, how the proposal would be handled would depend on whether a comprehensive review/update of the community plan was underway. If no comprehensive review was underway, a joint decision by City and County officials would determine if the amendment proposal merited the initiation of such a review. If a review was underway, the proposal would be evaluated in the course of that review.

Chairman Gallagher asked if UGB amendment and annexation would be considered at the same time for a proposal such as the 360 Ranch or Steamboat 700, either through a parallel or comprehensive process. Ms. Bessey acknowledged that most requests for amendments to the UGB are made with the intention of future annexation, but offered that minor changes might go through the annexation process more quickly because they could be done without all that goes into a comprehensive community plan review.

In response to a question from Commissioner Arel, Ms. Bessey stated that until a property is annexed it remains under County zoning with rural density. She confirmed that if the owners of a property such as Steamboat 700 wanted to subdivide into 35-acre parcels, they could do so even though the parcel is within the UGB. There was a discussion of the proposal to develop a small retail store near Steamboat II, and why it was not consistent with the Routt County Master Plan or the SSACP. Ms. Bessey stated that the County retains the right to zone any land within unincorporated Routt County, whether that land is within the UGB or not.

Commissioner Ayer noted the longstanding policy to require development in the West of Steamboat area to occur from east to west. Mr. Phillips stated that the policy in the West of Steamboat Springs Area Plan (WSSAP) specified that even after annexation, the development of that area would occur from east to west, eliminating “leap frog” development with undeveloped areas in between. He noted that this recommendation was removed from the WSSAP in 2006. He reviewed that the Riverbend re-development was somewhat different because it had been the site of a restaurant and rental cabins for a very long time.

Ms. Bessey stated that minor amendments to the UGB would generally apply to individual properties not likely to have a major impact beyond the immediate area and that would not necessitate any other revisions to the community plan. The impact would be limited to a minor adjustment to the UGB line. She reviewed the six draft criteria for an application to qualify as a minor amendment (page 10). She noted that a minor amendment would have no significant financial impacts on the City beyond those generally expected with infill development. She said that the City Planning Commission had requested a revision of the language of
proposed Criterion #2. Ms. Bessey highlighted that Criterion #4, which was taken from the state statute regarding annexation, would not only limit the size of the minor amendments, but would also ensure that the parcels would be eligible for annexation. She noted that throughout the discussions with the City Planning Commission on the draft criteria there was a parallel discussion regarding what submittals would be required of an applicant for a minor amendment. Ms. Bessey stated that no detailed fiscal impact studies or engineered analysis of infrastructure would be required. She noted that many of the criteria are qualitative, reflecting the fact that any decision regarding an amendment to the UGB is a policy decision regarding future growth and its impacts.

Ms. Bessey reviewed that a major change to the UGB, which would have significant impacts and require more than an alteration of the line on the map, would be reviewed within the vision of the broader community as described in the SSACP. She offered that if making a major change would require modifications to the SSACP and the community was not willing to adjust elements of the plan to accommodate the proposed major change to the UGB, then that change would be considered incompatible with the plan. Ms. Bessey reviewed the six items for consideration regarding major amendments to the UGB (page 10) and suggested that these are the same questions that should be asked when any review or update of the SSACP is conducted. She offered that while there may be a lot of land available within the UGB for development, that land might not be suitable for a specific land use. The need for that specific land use might then prompt a consideration of an amendment to the UGB.

Commissioner Klumker asked about the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) referred to in the handout. Ms. Bessey said that the City does have a TAC, adding that all the relevant agencies of the City and County governments, as well as the utilities would be involved in any major amendment to the UGB. In response to a question from Commissioner Klumker regarding the Steamboat 700 property, Ms. Bessey said that state statute requires 1/6th contiguity with the City boundary for annexation. She demonstrated how this calculation works on a site plan. She said that the areas eligible for minor expansion of the UGB under the draft changes, would be contiguous with the City boundary, but currently not included within the UGB. Commissioner Klumker asked about the objective of the proposed changes, offering that the UGB represents an impediment to growth. Ms. Bessey stated that the objective of the proposed changes is neither to promote nor to discourage growth of Steamboat Springs, but rather to assess whether the current criteria and processes through which the UGB is amended are serving the community well. She offered that the problem may not be with the criteria at all, but rather with the processes that treat large and small amendments the same. Mr. Gibbs added that annexation, which is an even more rigorous process, determines where the City will grow - not the expansion of the UGB.

Commissioner Horn cited an exercise performed several years ago regarding the community’s vision for its future growth, and asked if the results of that study had
been measured against the proposed changes to the SSACP to see if they align. Ms. Bessey stated that although the responses to the cited exercise varied widely, the study provided no indication of a broad desire for expansion of the UGB. Mr. Gibbs added that few of the participants were inclined to place growth outside the City limits, much less outside the UGB.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Ben Beall said that he was involved with the creation of the UGB and remains committed to its value. He stated that the UGB represents the community plan and was created not by the elected officials but rather by the citizens of both the City and the County. He described the growth pressures in play in the 1990s and emphasized that the UGB was created as a tool to protect the rural character of Routt County, beginning right outside the City limits. Mr. Beall said that County citizens did not and do not now want rural or urban sprawl in the County. The idea was that the City would assume responsibility for the expansion of urban-density growth. Mr. Beall stated his support for the UGB, adding that he was not opposed to the proposed changes, with some adjustments.

Mr. Beall recommended retaining the existing UGB policy; adding to the proposed criteria for UGB minor changes; and completing the update to the SSACP with UGB process changes and two major changes to the UGB. The details of these recommendations are included in Mr. Beall’s letter dated March 20, 2014. Mr. Beall stated that not expanding the UGB until the land within the UGB is largely built-out represents a significant vision of the community (Policy GM-1.1). He offered that this idea was not incompatible with a change to the UGB in response to specific needs cited as a possibility by Ms. Bessey. Mr. Beall suggested that of the list of the eleven applications for amendments to the UGB that have been denied over the years, there are probably four that are appropriate, three of which are less than 3 acres in size. He offered that the size of a parcel appropriate for a minor adjustment should be specified. He recommended a threshold of 5 acres or less.

Mr. Beall suggested that conformance with the surrounding area and the preferred character of Special Planning Area goals and policies be added to the minor amendment criteria, along with a criterion stating that changes will not impact agricultural lands, critical wildlife areas, natural areas, waterways, wetlands and the community’s existing and proposed open spaces, parks and trail systems. These are already in the list of considerations for major amendments.

Mr. Beall stated that there is sufficient information available to put together an update of the community plan, or an addendum to the existing plan. He offered that the proposed changes to the processes regarding the amendment of the UGB should be considered as significant changes to the SSACP and should constitute an update to the plan. Mr. Beall stated that, as part of the update, there are two major adjustments to the UGB that should be made: protecting the potable water fields south of Steamboat Springs and dividing the area west of Steamboat Springs into two areas. This would make it clear to the public that the
development of this area will occur in a manageable fashion, from east to west, and would reflect the vote of the residents on Steamboat 700. Mr. Beall stated that he is committed to ensuring that the UGB continues to work for the community.

Mr. Rodge Steen, representing the Community Alliance of the Yampa Valley (CAYV), cited his letter dated March 20, 2014. He agreed that the UGB and the SSACP have served the community well, and that it was appropriate to consider changes to them over time. Mr. Steen offered that the philosophy of the UGB as stated in existing policy GM-1.1 is important and accurate, if somewhat awkwardly phrased. He stated that the proposed change to this language loosens and weakens the concept. Regarding the criteria required for minor amendments, Mr. Steen said that the CAYV agrees with Mr. Beall that a maximum area should be specified. He suggested that 5 acres was appropriate, based on the applications that have been submitted since the UGB was created. Mr. Steen added that it is important that a condition be added stating that any amendments to the UGB should not have significant impacts to the surrounding community’s natural resources, such as parks, rivers and trails.

Mr. Al Rosenthal stated that he has been involved in the discussion of possible changes to the UGB amendment process since its inception. He stated that staff has done a really good job at synthesizing all of the input from all of the meetings at the City and County levels, including that of the public. He stated his support for the draft changes, as presented.

Seeing no further comment, Chairman Gallagher closed public comment.

Mr. Gibbs reviewed the thought process behind the proposed criteria. Regarding the notion that “built-out” could refer to a subset of the available land that is suitable for a particular type of use, Mr. Gibbs stated that this is not what the existing language says. As an example, he noted that Yampa Valley Electric Association has purchased property, partly in the City and partly in the County across from the Steamboat Springs Airport. YVEA would like to assemble those parcels to develop its new campus. If the “largely built-out” criterion applies, this small project could not be accomplished because all of the UGB has not been largely built-out. He also noted that this property contains 14 acres. Mr. Gibbs stated that the question is whether a comprehensive review of the SSACP would be needed before a decision could be made on this particular parcel. Mr. Gibbs offered that if the criteria are too specific, they might preclude an otherwise reasonable request from moving forward. He reiterated that the proposed revisions were made without any particular parcel of land in mind. He added that staff is concerned that specifying a particular acreage would put emphasis on the size of the adjustment without full consideration being given to the other more qualitative criteria.

Regarding the change to the “largely built-out” language, Ms. Bessey stated that staff did not intend to make a major shift in policy, but rather to clarify the
concept, which is not actually written into the criteria. Chairman Gallagher asked about Mr. Beall's suggestion of adding two of the considerations for a major change to the minor change criteria. Ms. Bessey said that these suggestions seem reasonable, but offered that some issues, like impact on agricultural land or wildlife, may not be applicable to minor amendments since any area eligible for a minor adjustment must be suitable for urban-style development. Chairman Gallagher offered that the language regarding the minor and major changes should be parallel whenever appropriate to express the same concept.

Mr. Phillips reminded Planning Commission of the development pressures on the community at the time the UGB was created and the concept of "largely built-out" was conceived. He noted that the original plan projected that all of the infill and most of the land within the UGB would have been built-out by now.

Commissioner Warnke stated that he sees the proposed changes as having more to do with process, whereas as Mr. Beall seems to see them as changes to the plan itself. Mr. Beall clarified that he agrees with the proposed revisions to the process, but had also made some recommendations regarding additions to the criteria. He added that the update that is scheduled to occur every five to six years could be satisfied by creating an appendix that would include all the work being done now and the data that has been gathered in recent years. Chairman Beall expressed concern that the work that was done is not being considered as a valid update because there was so little community participation. He offered that the relatively small participation does not invalidate the process, and may indicate a certain level of satisfaction with the existing policies. Mr. Beall stated that any proposed changes to the policies and strategies should be considered a review of the plan, and should include the public hearings and approvals required of a full update to the plan.

Mr. Gibbs stated that the SSACP update is not being thrown out. The data gathered is being assembled as an appendix to the existing plan. He stated that the update process is distinct from the review of the UGB amendment criteria. Ms. Bessey stated that the intent is for the proposed changes to go through the appropriate hearings, processes and approvals necessary to formally amend the community plan.

Commissioner Arel offered that he agrees with the changes in process to allow for minor and major amendments to the UGB, but added that something needs to change to allow growth to occur where the community has said it wants it. He suggested that the original UGB might have been too big in the West of Steamboat area. Mr. Gibbs stated that before considering changes to the UGB, the process through which those changes can occur and criteria on which the changes should be based must be settled.

Commissioner Ayer stated his agreement with Mr. Beall's third recommendation (regarding the completion of the SSACP update) and stated his support for developing separate processes for minor and major amendments. He stated,
however, that the UGB was created during a time of high development pressure and rapid growth, and may not be appropriate for the current circumstances and needs of the community. He suggested that the location of the UGB should be revisited and perhaps redrawn, incorporating some areas and excluding others - but continuing to serve as a hard edge between urban and rural development. Commissioner Ayer suggested that a smaller area within the UGB, based on current data, would increase predictability and allow the City to be the driver of its expansion in response to the needs for particular types of land uses. He contrasted this to the current situation in which growth seems to be driven by private developers.

Commissioner Merrill stated that the five-acre maximum that had been suggested for minor amendments to the UGB was too small. He suggested that 20 - 25 acres was more appropriate. Chairman Gallagher noted that at urban-level residential density, a 25-acre development would be very large. Commissioner Merrill offered that each development would still be evaluated on its individual merits, and that the larger acreage would allow for more flexibility. Mr. Gibbs agreed, noting that not all development occurs at high densities. Commissioner Ayer added that flexibility was important and stated that maintaining the qualitative approach might be preferable. He cited the YVEA example mentioned by Mr. Gibbs. Commissioner Arel stated his support for relaxing the criteria to make it easier for UGB expansions to occur if they are reasonable. He said that the process should be open to various types of projects. Commissioner Klumker agreed with Commissioner Arel, adding that the growth should be stimulated, not stifled. Chairman Gallagher offered that the purpose was neither to stimulate nor to hinder growth.

Mr. Phillips asked Ms. Bessey to elaborate on what would occur after a decision is made on whether a proposal is a minor or major change. Ms. Bessey stated that the flow chart discussed earlier only outlines the process through which that initial determination is made. She said that prior to the joint hearing scheduled for April 10th, she would expand the flow chart to describe the elements included in the minor plan amendment process and the comprehensive review/update process. Ms. Bessey clarified that the criteria discussed thus far, including any limit on acreage, would determine only the level of review. Mr. Phillips added that Planning Commission would review both types of applications, but that under the minor amendment process the review would be only of the proposed amendment to the UGB; under the major amendment process, the entire plan would be reviewed.

In response to a question from Chairman Gallagher regarding how work on this issue would proceed, Ms. Bessey said that all of the comments and input received from this meeting, as well as the work sessions with the City Planning Commission and the joint meeting of the two planning commissions (April 10th) would be compiled into an adoption draft for the next joint meeting of the Board of County Commissioners and City Council, currently scheduled for June. She noted that in the City process, the Planning Commission is a recommending body.
to City Council, which adopts the plan. At the County level, Planning Commission is the adopting authority of the plan, followed by ratification by the Board. The meeting on April 10th will be a work session for County Planning Commission and a formal public hearing for City Planning Commission. This will allow City Planning Commission to make a formal recommendation at that time. Ms. Bessey stated that if the commissions are not satisfied with the draft, the schedule can be altered accordingly.

Commissioner Arel asked if it would be possible to identify the number and location of the properties that meet the 1/6th contiguity with the City boundary criterion. Mr. Gibbs stated that the process of determining this is not as simple as it sounds, and depends on many variables that can change. Chairman Gallagher noted that most of the properties are the edge of Old Town.

Commissioner Ayer announced that this is Chairman Gallagher's and Commissioner Horn's last meeting. He commended them both and acknowledged their service to the community. Following a discussion of procedure, Planning Commission decided to move forward with the election of officers.

**ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

**MOTION**
Commissioner Klumker nominated Brian Arel for the position of Chairman. Commissioner Warnke seconded the motion.

Commissioner Merrill nominated Steve Warnke for the position of Chairman. Commissioner Horn seconded the motion.

The votes for Commissioner Arel were 2; the votes for Commissioner Warnke were 3, with the Chairman abstaining. Steve Warnke was elected Chairman.

**MOTION**
Commissioner Klumker nominated John Ayer for the position of Vice-Chairman. Commissioner Arel seconded the motion.

Commissioner Ayer nominated Brian Arel for the position of Vice-Chairman. Chairman Gallagher seconded the motion.

The votes for Commissioner Ayer were 1; the votes for Commissioner Arel were 4, with the Chairman abstaining. Brian Arel was elected Vice-Chair.

**ADMINISTRATOR 'S REPORT**
Mr. Phillips announced that with Jennifer Valentine's departure, Alan Goldich has been promoted to Planner II. He said that he has initiated the search to fill the Planner I position.
Mr. Phillips reported that staff had met with Southwestern Energy, which is purchasing the leases from Shell and Quicksilver.

Ms. Winser and Mr. Phillips reviewed the upcoming agendas and applications being processed.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.
Steamboat Stone Supply, Inc.

Site Plan Review

ACTIVITY #: PP2014-001
HEARING DATES: Planning Commission (PC): May 1, 2014 at 6:00pm

PETITIONER: James Lewis
PETITION: Commercial Site Plan Review
LOCATION: 35795 US Highway 40
ZONE DISTRICT: Commercial (C)
AREA: 1 acre
STAFF CONTACT: Alan Goldich
ATTACHMENTS: • Applicant’s Narrative  
• Site Plan  
• Photos of Site and Office Trailer  
• Comments from the City of Steamboat Springs  
• Comments from the Mt. Werner Water District  
• Comments from CDOT

History:
Clifford and Sherry Heltzel own a 1.00 acre parcel south of Steamboat Springs.  The parcel was originally created in May 1965 and Commercial zoning was approved on May 11, 1982.

The parcel is in the Commercial zone district. Many uses over time have been operated on this site. Some of these were mostly temporary retail sales for such things as bear carvings; antler art; various storage and landscaping businesses and some light industrial uses. The applicant operated this stone business out of this site from 1989-1991.

There was a valid temporary CDOT access permit for this site. It expired in 2010 and a new one has been applied for.

Site Description:
The parcel is located on the west side of US Hwy 40, approximately .25 mile south of Steamboat Springs. There are two-1 acre Commercial lots located in this area and one 1-acre Agriculture/Forestry (A/F) lot with a County Land Use Permit on it. The parcel to the north is the Mt. Werner Vet Hospital (zoned A/F) and the parcel to the south is the Shop and Hop Gas Station (zoned Commercial). The Heltzel parcel is a vacant parcel located between the Vet Hospital and Shop and Hop.
The parcel has direct access off of US Highway 40 and is graded and basically level. There are no structures located on the parcel, but electric hookup is available.

The parcel currently has no permanent buildings or permanent storage. There are no fences on the property. The site is flat and graveled. It is bordered on the north property line with a row of large mature cottonwood trees. They help to screen the property from the Mount Werner Veterinary Hospital along with its garage.

The access is at the northern end of the property. There is no access permit onto U.S. Highway 40 from the Colorado Department of Transportation but one has been applied for. There is a narrow drainage ditch running parallel along U.S. Highway 40 that is culverted at the access point. There is a 5’-6’ berm on the south property line and that berm extends around to the east property line, ending at the access point.

Mt. Werner Water District provides water to the City of Steamboat Springs. Their infiltration galleries are located to the east of this site. This site lies within the two year zone of contribution to the District’s wellfields. An explanation of this is in the attached letter from the Water District.

This site falls within the area of the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan.

**Project Description:**
The applicant proposes to open a stone supply yard for the retail sales of stone and stone supplies. It would also be used for the storage of stone and supplies. The site will have an office trailer measuring 10’x20’ to accommodate the retail aspect of the operation. The office trailer currently is black and white and the applicant has not proposed to paint it. A forklift and skid steer will be on site and used in the loading/unloading and moving of material. No fuel for these machines will be stored on-site. Cutting of stone will take place on site but there will be no cutting lubricants used or stored on site. The proposed hours of operation are from 9:00 am until 5:00 pm. The applicant is anticipating 10 customers per day. The operation would have 1 to 2 employees. The site is accessed directly off of US Highway 40 and there is only one point of access.

The applicant has stated that stones will be stacked on pallets and will be a maximum of 5 feet tall. There will also be a structure, with no roof, separated into 6 separate storage bins for the storage of decorative sands and gravels. This structure will be made out of beetle kill timber and will be a maximum of 5 feet tall.

***Issues for Discussion***

- Visual Impacts; If approved, Planning Commission will have to decide if the bolded conditions of approval, numbers 24 and 25, are appropriate to apply to this application.
- Impacts to Water Quality
- Noise impacts from loading and un-loading of materials and the cutting of stone
- Will the office trailer be on site year round?
Compliance with the Routt County Master Plan, Sub Area Plans and Zoning Resolution

The Routt County Master Plan, Sub Area plans and Zoning Resolution contain dozens of policies and regulations regarding land use. Section 5 Regulations are designed to limit or eliminate conditions that could negatively impact the environment and/or use of surrounding properties, and shall apply in all Zone Districts and to all land uses unless otherwise noted. Section 6 Regulations apply to all Minor, Administrative, Conditional or Special uses allowed by permit only, PUD plans, Site plans, and Subdivisions.

The following checklist was developed by Planning Staff to highlight the policies and regulations most directly applicable to this petition. The checklist is divided into seven (7) major categories:

1. Health, Safety and Nuisances
2. Regulations and Standards
3. Community Character and Visual Issues
4. Roads, Transportation and Site Design
5. Natural Environment
6. Mitigation

Interested parties are encouraged to review the Master Plan, Sub Area plans and Zoning Resolution to determine if there are other policies and regulations that may be applicable to the review of this petition.

Staff Comments are included at the end of each section, highlighting items where the public, referral agencies, or planning staff have expressed questions and/or comments regarding the proposal. Staff comments regarding compliance with regulations and policies are noted in bold below.

Public Health, Safety and Nuisances

Applicable Regulations – Routt County Zoning Resolution

5.1.1 Every use shall be operated so that it does not pose a danger to public health, safety or welfare.

5.1.2 Every use shall be operated in conformance with all applicable federal, state and local regulations and standards. Failure to comply with any and all applicable federal, state and local regulations and standards may be cause for review and/or revocation of any Land Use Approval granted pursuant to these regulations.

6.1.2 The proposal shall be consistent with applicable Master Plans and sub-area plans.

6.1.7.C Natural Hazards
6.1.7.H Wildland Fire
6.1.7.I Noise
6.1.7.L Odors
6.1.7.M Vibration
8.4.4 Central sewage collection system that includes secondary treatment and disinfection facilities as approved by the Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment and the local health authority are required for all new buildings and uses.

Staff comments: The application as proposed does not pose a danger to the public and is consistent with the Routt County Master Plan. A condition of approval which addresses federal, state and local law is suggested. There are no mapped natural hazards on the site. The area is mapped as a moderate fire danger but the Steamboat Rural Fire Department did not see any fire code issues related to this operation. No significant impacts from odor or vibration are expected. The applicant has stated that cutting will take place on site, but no oils or mineral based lubricants will be used. Hammers, chisels, and drills will be used to cut the stones. The vet clinic has stated in the past the loading of stone has caused a disturbance and would like to see that addressed. An outhouse is shown on the site plan and Environmental Health feels that is adequate for the proposed use. Environmental Health did not have any other concerns.

**Is the application in compliance with the Policies and Regulation outlined above?** Yes or No

### Regulations and Standards

#### Applicable Regulations – Routt County Zoning Resolution

- **5.2** Dimensional Standards:
- **6.1.5** The proposal shall meet or exceed accepted industry standards and Best Management Practices.

#### Applicable Policies – Routt County Master Plan

- **5.3.A** The County encourages the use of “green” building techniques that lead to the conservation of energy and overall reduction of pollution in our environment.
- **5.3.D** Require Best Management Practices and grading plans and strongly discourage overlot grading.

Staff comments: Dimensional standards in the Commercial zone district are determined by Planning Commission. A small office will be on-site to handle retail transactions. No grading or surface disturbance is proposed as part of this operation.

**Is the application in compliance with the Policies and Regulation outlined above?** Yes or No

### Community Character and Visual Concerns

#### Applicable Regulations – Routt County Zoning Resolution

- **5.1.4** Outdoor storage of materials which might cause fumes, odors, dust, fire hazard, or health hazards is prohibited unless such storage is within enclosed containers or unless a determination is made that such use will not have a detrimental impact on the environment
- **5.9** Sign Standards
6.1.6 Outdoor Lighting: The proposal shall comply with the Outdoor Lighting Standards in Section 6.3 of these Regulations.

6.1.7.O Historical Significance.

8.1.4.A Compatibility with adjacent land uses.
8.1.4.C General conformance with setbacks on nearby commercial properties; unless such conformance is determined to be inappropriate due to particular characteristics of the site or the proposed use.

8.4.2.A General conformance with bulk and placement of surrounding buildings; unless such conformance is determined to be inappropriate due to particular characteristics of the site or the proposed use.
8.4.2.B Protection of visual amenities
8.4.2.C Style and character of all structures will be compatible with or complementary to existing structures and the surrounding area.

8.4.3 Landscaping including native plantings, berms, fencing, and street hardware (benches, lighting, bike racks, etc.) may be required for the protection of visual amenities, to provide screening for outdoor storage, parking or dumpster area, and/or to ensure compatibility with adjacent properties.

**Applicable Policies – Routt County Master Plan**

5.3.B While respecting private property rights, the County will not approve development applications or special use permits that would lead to the degradation of the environment without proper mitigation that would bring the proposal into compliance with the Master Plan, appropriate sub-area plans, Zoning Resolution, and Subdivision Regulations.

5.3.E Routt County requires that all new developments do not contribute to light pollution.
5.3.F Routt County will continue to consider the impacts of development and uses on view corridors, water, wetland, and air.

**Applicable Policies – Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan**

CD-3.1 Maintain the rural landscape outside of the City of Steamboat Springs.
CD-4.1 Major highways and arterials shall maintain a high quality of design.
CD-4.2 Protect Scenic Corridors and the community’s key gateways.
SPA-6.3 Maintain the visual quality of the community’s southern community gateway.

**Staff comments:** Nothing proposed to be stored outside is considered a health hazard and degradation of the environment is not anticipated. No sign is proposed, but if one is desired, a sign permit will need to be obtained. A condition of approval addressing this is suggested. No lighting is proposed and a condition of approval addressing this is
suggested. Even though the property to the north is zoned A/F, a vet clinic is located on it. The parcel to the south has a gas station and convenience store on it. This site, in the past, has been used for commercial activities such as this. This site is one of the first things people see when entering Steamboat Springs. The city of Steamboat Springs has concerns with the visual impact from this operation. The existing berm will screen the storage area to some extent but will not screen the parking area or office trailer. The applicant has not proposed landscape screening. There are some shrubs growing in the ditch in between the Highway and the site on the north side of the entrance. A condition of approval addressing visual impacts is included in the suggested conditions if Planning Commission feels screening is needed. Planning Commission needs to determine if the existing level of screening is adequate, or if more is needed. The office trailer is smaller than any structure on neighboring parcels but it is closer to the Highway than any of those structures. The use on this site is in general conformance with setbacks on neighboring properties.

**Is the application in compliance with the Policies and Regulation outlined above?**  Yes or No

### Roads, Transportation and Site Design

#### Applicable Regulations – Routt County Zoning Resolution

- **5.4** Parking Standards
- **5.5** Addressing Standards
- **5.6** Access to Buildable Lot Standards
- **5.7** Right of Way Access Standards: A Right of Way Access Permit is required prior to construction of any new access point onto a County Road or other Local Public Road or Right of Way.
- **5.8** Road Construction Standards
- **6.1.4** Public Road Use Performance Standards: The proposal shall comply with the Public Road Use Performance Standards in Section 6.2 of these Regulations.
- **6.1.7.A** Public Roads, Services and Infrastructure
- **6.1.7.B** Road Capacity, traffic, and traffic safety
- **6.1.7.N** Snow Storage
- **8.1.4.B** Safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access, circulation, and parking
- **8.4.1.D** Ability to provide for adequate property maintenance including but not limited to: access to public utilities, snow removal and storage, and site/landscaping maintenance.

#### Applicable Policies – Routt County Master Plan

- **11.3.K** Since roads and highways provide the window from which many people view the county, signage, landscape and road design and location should be coordinated and tempered to preserve rural character.
- **11.3.P** Discourage new use permits and zone changes that increase density that will exceed acceptable traffic levels.

**Staff comment:** This use falls into the retail category in regards to the number of parking spaces required. The regulations require one parking space per 300 square feet of floor
area and the Planning Director is requiring spaces for employees above what is required by the use. The area shown on the site plan for parking will provide space for 9 vehicles and this is enough to satisfy the parking requirements. Routt County Addressing did not have any comments for this application. An access permit from CDOT is required and has been applied for. A condition of approval is suggested which addresses this. No new roads are being proposed. There appears to be enough room for snow storage and safe and convenient circulation.

**Is the application in compliance with the Policies and Regulation outlined above? Yes or No**

### Natural Environment

#### Applicable Regulations – Routt County Zoning Resolution

- 5.11 Waterbody Setback Standards
- 6.1.7.D Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat.
- 6.1.7.E Water Quality and Quantity.
- 6.1.7.F Air Quality.
- 6.1.7.J Wetlands.
- 6.1.7.P Reclamation and Restoration.
- 6.1.7.Q Noxious Weeds.

#### Applicable Policies – Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan

- NS-1.1 New development will not occur in the 100-year floodplains and will be designed to protect water quality and riparian areas.
- NS-2.2 The city and county will ensure that both groundwater and surface waters are protected from degradation and are of a high quality.

**Staff comments:** There are no mapped waterbodies in the vicinity of this site. The mapped floodplain crosses the northwest corner of the site but since no development is taking place in that area, a Floodplain Development permit will not be required. There is no mapped critical wildlife habitat on this site. There will be no fuel stored on-site and no cutting lubricants will be used on-site, therefore no impacts to water quality are anticipated. Dust may be an issue during dry and windy periods. A condition of approval addressing dust is suggested. No negative impacts to wetlands are anticipated. The office structure will be set on the ground, therefore no site disturbance is expected but noxious weeds will still have to be controlled. A condition of approval addressing noxious weeds is suggested.

**Is the application in compliance with the Policies and Regulation outlined above?** Yes or No

### Mitigation Techniques

#### Applicable Regulations – Routt County Zoning Resolution
Mitigation Techniques for Development Within a Natural Hazard Area – Flood Hazard Areas

6.5.9.A Ensure development does not aggravate an existing flood hazard or increase flood hazard to upstream or downstream properties.

6.5.9.F Limit development to non-dwelling uses that will not be damaged when flooded.

Mitigation Techniques to Reduce Air Quality Impacts:

6.8.B Gravel, water or chemically stabilize public and private access roads, stripped areas, transfer points and excavations to minimize dust.

6.8.D Increase watering operations immediately in response to periods of high wind conditions or dust complaints.

Mitigation Techniques to Reduce Noise Impacts:

6.10.A Limit hours of operation.

6.10.J Place the operation a sufficient distance from residences, commercial areas, and recreation areas to minimize noise impacts to those areas.

Staff comments: The mapped floodplain crosses the northwest corner of the site but no site modification will take place. There will be no residential uses taking place on-site. A condition of approval addressing dust and watering activity to control dust is suggested. There are no residential uses near this site and the proposed hours of operation are 9 am to 5 pm.

**Is the application in compliance with the Policies and Regulation outlined above? Yes or No

PLANNING COMMISSION / BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OPTIONS:

1. Approve the Site Plan Review request without conditions if it is determined that the petition will not adversely affect the public health, safety, and welfare and the proposed use is compatible with the immediately adjacent and nearby neighborhood properties and uses and the proposal is in compliance with the Routt County Zoning Regulations and complies with the guidelines of the Routt County Master Plan.

2. Deny the Site Plan Review request if it is determined that the petition will adversely affect the public health, safety, and welfare and/or the proposed use is not compatible with the immediately adjacent and nearby neighborhood properties and uses and/or the proposed use is not in compliance with the Routt County Zoning Regulations and/or the Routt County Master Plan, Make specific findings of fact; cite specific regulations or policies by number from the Routt County Master Plan, and the Routt County Zoning Regulations.

3. Table the Site Plan Review request if additional information is required to fully evaluate the petition. Give specific direction to the petitioner and staff.

4. Approve the Site Plan Review request with conditions and/or performance standards if it is determined that certain conditions and/or performance standards are necessary to ensure public, health, safety, and welfare and/or make the use compatible with immediately adjacent and neighborhood properties and uses and/or bring the proposal into compliance with the Routt County Zoning Regulations and Routt County Master Plan.

FINDINGS OF FACT that may be appropriate if the Site Plan Review is approved:
1. The proposal with the following conditions meets the guidelines of the Routt County Master Plan and is in compliance with Sections 4, 5, 6 and 8.17 of the Routt County Zoning Regulations.

**CONDITIONS** that may be appropriate may include the following:

**General Conditions:**

1. The Site Plan approval is contingent upon compliance with the applicable provisions of the Routt County Zoning Regulations including but not limited to Sections 4, 5, 6, and 8.17

2. The Site Plan approval is limited to uses and facilities presented in the approved project plan. Any additional uses or facilities must be applied for in a new or amended application.

3. Any complaints or concerns which may arise from this operation may be cause for review of the SUP, at any time, and amendment or addition of conditions, or revocation of the permit if necessary.

4. In the event that Routt County commences an action to enforce or interpret this SUP, the substantially prevailing party shall be entitled to recover its costs in such action including, without limitation, attorney fees.

5. No junk, trash, or inoperative vehicles shall be stored on the property.

6. This approval is contingent upon any required federal, state and local permits being obtained and complied with; the operation shall comply with all federal, state and local laws. Copies of permits or letters of approval shall be submitted to the Routt County Planning Department prior to operations.

7. Fuel, flammable materials, or hazardous materials shall be kept in a safe area and shall be stored in accordance with state and local environmental requirements.

8. All exterior lighting shall be downcast and opaquely shielded.

9. Prior to the issuance of the permit, the permittee shall provide evidence of liability insurance in the amount of no less than $1,000,000 per occurrence with either unlimited aggregate or a policy endorsement requiring notice to Routt County of all claims made. Routt County shall be named as an additional insured on the policy. Certificate of liability insurance shall include all permit numbers associated with the activity.

10. Revegetation of disturbed areas shall occur within one growing season with a seed mix which avoids the use of aggressive grasses. See the Colorado State University Extension Office for appropriate grass seed mixes.

11. Accessory structures/uses associated with this permit may be administratively approved by the Planning Director.

12. The permits/approval shall not be issued until all fees have been paid in full. Failure to pay fees may result in revocation of this permit. Permits/Approvals that require an ongoing review will be assessed an Annual Fee. Additional fees for mitigation monitoring will be charged on an hourly basis for staff time required to review and/or implement conditions of approval.

13. The permittee shall prevent the spread of weeds to surrounding lands, and comply with the Colorado Noxious Weed Act as amended in 2013 and Routt County noxious weed management plan.
Specific Conditions:

14. The Site Plan Review is valid for the life of the use.

15. Use of the site shall be limited to the hours of 9 am until 5 pm.

16. Outdoor storage may be permitted if stored in approved location and adequately screened or fenced from adjoining roads or properties.

17. No hazardous materials shall be stored within the permitted area.

18. No vehicles that area more than “single axle” shall be parking on the site for purposes other than daily delivery or shipping to the use. The compatibility of overnights parking of any other vehicles on site shall be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

19. Fugitive dust will be controlled by the use of water and other control measures as appropriate, as often as necessary, to reduce, control and minimize all dust generated by traffic, material processing and other activities related to the use. No off-site transport of visible dust emissions shall be allowed.

20. If a sign is desired for this operation, a sign permit shall be obtained.

21. The maximum height of stockpiles of stone, sand and/or gravel shall be five (5) feet.

22. No vehicle maintenance shall take place on site.

23. Permittee shall provide the Planning Department with a copy of the issued CDOT access permit prior to operation.

24. The applicant shall provide a screening plan to the Planning Director for approval. Such screening plan shall be implemented prior to operations on the site.

25. The office structure shall be painted a neutral color.
Proposal Narrative

Steamboat Stone Supply INC. (Steamboat Stone), proposes to reestablish a retail stone yard (The Yard) on the premises of 35795 U.S. Highway 40 East, Steamboat Springs, CO, 80487. The intent of this yard is for the retail sale of stone and stone supplies for landscaping, masonry, decorative and construction purposes. The Yard would also serve as storage for the stone and stone supplies. Additionally, an office would be located on The Yard for the purposes of completing retail invoices and additional storage.

A forklift and skid steer would be necessary equipment in the transportation and arrangement of the stone on The Yard. Both would reside on the yard with the sole purpose of moving and loading the stone.

The Yard’s hours of operation would be from 9:00 AM until 5:00 PM. Hours may vary slightly, depending on customer traffic. Approximately 10 customers per day is Steamboat Stone’s anticipated traffic on The Yard.

Steamboat Stone would have 1 to 2 employees present on The Yard during normal hours of operation to assist customers with the purchase and delivery of the stone and stone products.

The property would be accessible directly off Eastbound Highway 40 via a driveway into The Yard. This would be the only point of access into the property.
View of site from the south.

View of the existing screening berm.

View of existing vegetation on site.
City of Steamboat Springs
Department of Planning & Community Development
April 16, 2014

Alan Goldich
Routt County Planning Department
PO Box 773749
136 6th Street
Steamboat Springs, CO 80477
Sent Via Email: agoldich@co.routt.co.us

RE: Activity No. PP2014-001 – Steamboat Stone Supply

Dear Alan,

The City of Steamboat Springs Department of Planning and Community Development staff thanks you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed site plan review for the above referenced application.

The subject property is adjacent to one of the key viewpoints and is also located within a visually sensitive area as identified in the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan (SSACP) Visual Sensitivity Map (attached). In addition, the subject parcel lies within the City of Steamboat Springs’ drinking water supply 2-year zone of contribution to the well-fields.

Our primary concerns are that of the negative visual impacts that this project may have on the key viewpoint, visually sensitive areas, and the entry corridor to Steamboat Springs. We are also concerned about the possible degradation of the municipal water supply from this use because of its proximity to the Mount Werner Water District’s infiltration galleries. For these reasons the City of Steamboat Springs Department of Planning and Community Development finds that the proposed use is not appropriate for this location and recommends that this application not be approved. In the event that this application is approved, we recommend that the previously identified negative visual and environmental impacts be mitigated to the greatest extent possible. This should include screening with extensive berming and landscaping along property lines, as well as incorporating any mitigation recommendations as provided by Mount Werner Water District.

The subject property is within the boundaries of the Steamboat Springs Area Community Plan and, therefore, subject to the goals and policies of this plan. We believe the following goals and policies of SSACP support the concerns identified above:
1. **Goal CD-4:** Our community will maintain and improve the appearance of its corridors and gateways and will continue to have vibrant public spaces.

2. **Policy CD-4.1:** Major Highways and corridors shall maintain a high quality of design. “The right-of-way and adjacent land uses along major corridors within the Urban Growth Boundary should be designed to project a positive image of Steamboat Springs and the valley.”

3. **Policy CD-4.2:** Protect Scenic Corridors and the community’s key gateways.

4. **Policy NS-2.2:** The City and County will ensure that both groundwater and surface waters are protected from degradation and are of high quality.

We would appreciate you including this letter in your report to the Planning Commission. Please feel free to contact me with any questions or request my presence at the public hearing.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Rebecca D. Bessey, AICP
Principal Planner

cc: Richard Buccino, Mt. Werner Water
File #CO-14-01
April 17, 2014

Alan Goldich  
Routt County Planning Dept.  
PO Box 773749  
Steamboat Springs, CO 80477  
Sent via Email: agoldich@co.routt.co.us

RE: PP2014-001 Steamboat Stone Supply

Dear Alan,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the application of Steamboat Stone Supply.

Mount Werner Water, the supplier of municipal water to residents of Steamboat Springs, operates two groundwater infiltration galleries on District-owned property located in the meadows immediately north of Dougherty Road on the south side of Steamboat Springs. From these infiltration galleries, the District pumps groundwater from the Yampa River alluvium without the need to filter organic or other contaminates from the water. The groundwater table within the Yampa River alluvium is relatively shallow and flows in a northerly direction from the area of the project site towards the infiltration galleries.

In response to increasing development along the Yampa River, Mount Werner Water commissioned a study in 2002 to determine the 2, 5 and 10 year zones of contribution to the District’s infiltration galleries. Any hazardous materials spilled on the ground in these zones will eventually make their way, by permeation and groundwater flow, into the area of the District’s infiltration galleries where they may be intercepted and introduced into the municipal water system.

The proposed site of Steamboat Stone Supply lies within the 2-year zone of contribution to the District’s wellfields. Our concerns are the use and storage of hazardous materials on site; ie solvents on site for cutting or finishing product; or fuel, grease or hydraulic fluid for machines and equipment on site. Understanding the difficulty and cost of properly managing such materials on site, the District would prefer that no hazardous materials be used or stored on site.

We appreciate the cooperation and assistance of the County in helping to protect our public drinking water resources. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 879-2424.

Sincerely,

Mount Werner Water and Sanitation District

[Signature]

Jay Gallagher  
Mount Werner Water and Sanitation District

cc: Rebecca Bessey, Principal Planner, City of Steamboat Springs  
Jon Snyder, Water Superintendent, City of Steamboat Springs  
Kelly Heaney, Water Resources Manager, City of Steamboat Springs
Alan - Conceptually, I am not oppose to the proposal. In the last 9 years, this property has been several things (temporary construction yard, BBQ mobile stand, and a fruit stand). CDOT does have an access permit #308195 for a construction yard. However, this permit was a temporary access permit and it expired in 2010. Therefore, the landowner will need to get a permanent access permit for the use being proposed. Please have them apply for the permit. I don't think they will have any issues with us.

Thanks

Dan Roussin